

**CALIFORNIA MLPA INITIATIVE STATEWIDE INTERESTS GROUP**  
**DRAFT MEETING AGENDA**  
**Conference call**  
**December 16, 2004**  
**2:00 – 4:00 pm**

**Call-in information: Dial toll-free 1-800-820-4690 & enter 9922498#**

***Meeting Objectives:***

- 1. Review charge and confirm operating protocols*
- 2. Members of the group, staff and Task Force introduce themselves to one another and become better acquainted*
- 3. Debrief October Task Force meeting and stakeholder involvement opportunities, including the stakeholder panel*
- 4. Discuss stakeholder presentations for January Task Force meeting*
- 5. Discuss approach to stakeholder comments on draft Master Plan Framework*
- 6. Discuss how to balance multiple-stakeholder and single-stakeholder consultations*
- 7. Discuss frequency and timing of future Statewide Interest Group conference calls*
- 8. Summarize next steps*

- - - - -

- |    |   |                  |
|----|---|------------------|
| 1. | Welcome, roll call, and logistics for conference call<br>Phil Isenberg, MLPA Task Force Chair<br>John Kirlin, MLPA Initiative Executive Director<br>Gail Bingham, Resolve Facilitator | 2:00 – 2:10 p.m. |
| 2. | Introductions<br>- name, organization, constituency<br>- past involvement with MLPA   | 2:10 – 2:35 p.m. |
| 3. | Charge to the Statewide Interests Group   | 2:35 – 2:45 p.m. |
| 4. | Stakeholder involvement at October Task Force Meeting<br>- what went well<br>- suggestions for changes<br>- comments on the web site  | 2:45 – 3:00 p.m. |
| 5. | Stakeholder presentations for January<br>- objective – to learn more about the larger context (e.g. military uses) that affect assessment of need for protected areas                 | 3:00 – 3:15 p.m. |

- |    |   |                  |
|----|---|------------------|
| 6. | Process for stakeholder input in developing the draft Master Plan Framework <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- timing</li><li>- what mechanisms are most useful?</li></ul>   | 3:15 – 3:35 p.m. |
| 7. | Balancing multiple-stakeholder and single-stakeholder consultations   | 3:35 – 3:45 p.m. |
| 8. | Future Statewide Interests Group meetings & next steps <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- frequency, timing of meetings</li><li>- how well did this conference call work?</li><li>- in person meetings?</li><li>- dates and next steps</li></ul> | 3:45 – 4:00 p.m. |

**CALIFORNIA MARINE LIFE PROTECTION ACT INITIATIVE  
STATEWIDE INTERESTS GROUP  
DECEMBER 16, 2004 CONFERENCE CALL  
MEETING SUMMARY**

**Welcome, Roll Call and Logistics for Conference Call**

The meeting began with a brief welcome and introduction by Phil Isenberg, MLPA Task Force chair and his personal appreciation to all for their participation. MLPA Initiative staff were introduced, including John Kirlin, MLPA Initiative executive director; Mike Weber, senior project manager; Melissa Miller-Henson, MLPA Initiative operations & communications manager, and John Ugoretz, DFG's MLPA Policy Advisor. The facilitator, Gail Bingham from RESOLVE, called the roll with nearly all members present. By the end of the call, all members and alternates had participated with only one exception.

**Charge to the Statewide Interests Group (SIG)**

Melissa Miller-Henson explained that need for a state-level group such as this had been identified by participants in the MLPA Initiative constituent involvement roundtable discussions held in late August and early September 2004. She noted that the members of this group were nominated directly by stakeholders and selected based on their ability to communicate with a broad range of constituents. She also noted that the group's function is to provide feedback to the Blue Ribbon Task Force and the initiative staff regarding how the process is going and how to make it better. The initiative staff hope both to share information with stakeholders through the SIG and receive useful suggestions to improve the process. This is not a decision-making group, so it will not be required to vote on issues or reach consensus. It also is not a substitute for public hearings or other public processes on the issues themselves. Advice from this group may include help in identifying other stakeholders whose voices need to be heard in the process. The task force chair asked each of the SIG participants to give the task force a list of up to five specific concerns that it should keep its eyes on as the initiative process moves forward.

**Introductions**

Each SIG member and alternate present on the call was invited to introduce themselves and provide a little information about his or her organization and constituency and past involvement with the MLPA.

**Stakeholder Involvement at October 2004 Task Force Meeting**

SIG members were asked to describe what went well and what could be improved based on the October task force meeting and to make suggestions regarding future meetings and the MLPA website. Members expressed appreciation for the webcast of the meeting and the continuing availability of video and audio-only recordings of the meetings on the website. It was suggested that such coverage also be provided for the science team meetings. Initiative staff noted that webcasting is very expensive but that they are looking into it and are also considering the possibility of interactive webcasts. They will also be trying video conferencing for the January task force meeting (to be held at the foundation offices of the California State University, Long Beach) with videconference locations expected at:

- Humboldt State University in Arcata
- California State Association of Counties in Sacramento
- Cal Poly in San Luis Obispo
- National Marine Fishery Service in Santa Cruz

Broadcast on public access television also was suggested, although it may require special agreements with each station. Members also expressed appreciation for the opportunities for public comment at the task force meeting and for the openness of the meeting in general. Members expressed interest in receiving materials earlier in advance of the meeting and initiative staff said that was their goal, although it may not be achievable before the January meeting. Information on meeting and video conferencing sites and logistics will be available on the MLPA website.

### **Stakeholder Presentations for January Task Force Meeting**

Initiative staff explained that the objective for the January meeting is to provide the task force with information about the larger context in which the MLPA will be implemented, including the various other activities, laws, and regulations that will affect the assessment of need for protected areas. In particular, the military has requested an opportunity to present information on their activities, safety zones, and other issues. Initiative staff asked SIG members for additional suggestions of this type. Suggestions included information on:

- the effect of the California Ocean Protection Act on the MLPA
- National Marine Fisheries Service stock assessments
- restricted areas around nuclear or other power plants
- other federal law overlays or maps of existing protected areas or other use restrictions
- any other closed areas or marine protected areas (MPAs)
- previous studies by the Department of Parks and Recreation regarding biodiversity
- the existing framework regarding water quality

Members were requested to e-mail Melissa Miller-Henson with additional suggestions. Initiative staff informed participants that an initial overlay of all existing protected areas is being prepared but noted that it would not be complete by the January task force meeting. Staff also noted that the task force had been provided with Deborah McArdle's brochure on MPAs and with general information on existing MPAs and their status. Briefing material for the meetings will be posted on the web site, usually 10 days to 2 weeks prior to the meetings.

### **Process for Stakeholder Input in Developing the Draft Master Plan Framework**

Initiative staff provided a brief update on the status of the draft Master Plan Framework and asked for suggestions on how best to obtain stakeholder input. Staff is working from the table of contents presented at the October task force meeting and are developing an annotated version (with key questions and information sources noted) along with drafts of the simpler sections (e.g., background on MLPA and the initiative). Staff have drawn on comments received so far, and will provide stakeholder comments to the task force along with the annotated draft in their January meeting briefing packets. They will begin developing other elements after the January

task force meeting and will circulate drafts for comment and input from stakeholders and the science team (making clear that these are only drafts and not final decisions). The goal is to have the first draft prepared by mid-February.

Comments may be provided in writing, by e-mail, or even by telephone – all avenues are open. It was suggested that for some key issues (e.g., interpretation of goals and objectives, siting guidelines), it would be useful to convene workshops (with staff and stakeholders) for more in-depth discussion. Staff asked members to provide additional feedback on how best to organize such workshops and on which elements of the draft Master Plan Framework table of contents would benefit from such workshops. There was also discussion about how comments would be handled by the staff, and there were no objections to the suggestion that all member comments be posted to the MLPA website for other members and the public to read.

In response to a question, staff clarified that the prior MLPA regional working groups were disbanded. Any participants in those processes are welcome to join the MLPA Initiative listserv and can apply to participate when regional stakeholder groups are convened under the initiative process in the future. The central coast regional stakeholder group will be assembled shortly after the precise boundaries of the area are set by the task force, probably at the February meeting.

### **Balancing Multiple-Stakeholder and Single-Stakeholder Consultations**

John Kirlin, MLPA Initiative executive director, stated that he appreciated the suggestions regarding the use of workshops to address certain elements of the draft Master Plan Framework and regarding offers of technological ideas and assistance for the process. He noted that the initiative needs the SIG members to be a two-way conduit of information to and from their constituents and expressed appreciation for the direction the group is headed with support for transparency and openness in the process.

### **Future Statewide Interests Group Meetings and Next Steps**

Calls are planned to occur monthly, and the next call will be scheduled for shortly after the January task force meeting. Members were asked to e-mail Melissa Miller-Henson regarding:

- their availability for a call the week immediately after the January task force meeting
- specific contact information that they would like to be provided to the rest of the group

Members were advised that if they did not already have an alternate, they were free to send their nomination to Melissa Miller-Henson and that it would be reviewed and considered. Participants felt that a short (approximately two page) summary of SIG meetings/calls would be useful in sharing information about the calls, in lieu of detailed minutes. Members expressed satisfaction with the conference call format, and Chair Isenberg thanked the members for their participation.

**CALIFORNIA MARINE LIFE PROTECTION ACT INITIATIVE  
STATEWIDE INTERESTS GROUP  
DRAFT MEETING AGENDA**

**January 27, 2005  
1:45 – 3:45 p.m.  
(via conference call)**

**Call-in information: Dial toll free 888.887.0127 and enter 833424 at the prompt**

***Meeting Objectives***

1. *Debrief January task force meeting and stakeholder involvement opportunities, including the stakeholder panel (what went well and what might be improved?)*
2. *Discuss how stakeholder presentations and possible field trip can help task force achieve the objectives for the February meeting*
3. *Obtain update on, and discuss approach to, stakeholder comments on draft master plan framework*
4. *Learn about and discuss proposed February workshops for stakeholder involvement in applying the criteria adopted by the task force for selecting the central coast project area*
5. *Updates on future meeting dates (Blue Ribbon Task Force, Statewide Interests Group and Science Advisory Team)*
6. *Share other ideas for strengthening stakeholder involvement*
7. *Summarize next steps*

- - - - -

- |    |   |                  |
|----|---|------------------|
| 1. | Welcome, roll call, and logistics for conference call<br><i>Phil Isenberg, MLPA Task Force chair</i><br><i>Gail Bingham, facilitator</i>  | 1:45 – 1:55 p.m. |
| 2. | Stakeholder involvement at January task force meeting <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- what went well?</li><li>- suggestions for changes</li><li>- comments on the web site</li></ul>  | 1:55 – 2:10 p.m. |
| 3. | February task force meeting<br><i>[Key objectives: 1) selection of central coast project area and 2) review of initial draft language on design and evaluation of MPAs and MPA networks, and on monitoring and evaluation]</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- composition of expert panel (who, if anyone, in addition to selected members of the science team?)</li><li>- approach to stakeholder panel (how structured, who?)</li><li>- suggestions for field trip</li></ul> | 2:10 – 2:45 p.m. |

*MLPA Statewide Interests Group  
January 27, 2005 Meeting  
Draft Agenda (January 26, 2005)*

4. Process for stakeholder comments on draft master plan framework 2:45 – 3:00 p.m.
  - information about proposed approach and timing
  - clarification questions?
  - suggestions for improvement?
5. Applying central coast criteria stakeholder workshops 3:00 – 3:20 p.m.
  - information: purpose, dates and locations.
  - clarification questions?
  - timing preferences?
  - suggestions for improvement?
6. Open discussion 3:20 – 3:35 p.m.  
*[What topics would you like to address that you haven't been asked?]*
7. Information on future meeting dates 3:35 – 3:40 p.m.  
*[BRTF, SIG, SAT]*
  - any major events that pose conflicts?
8. Wrap up 3:40 – 3:45 p.m.
  - action items and next steps
  - suggestions for future SIG agenda items

**CALIFORNIA MARINE LIFE PROTECTION ACT INITIATIVE  
STATEWIDE INTERESTS GROUP (SIG)  
JANUARY 27, 2005 CONFERENCE CALL  
MEETING SUMMARY**

**Welcome, Roll Call, and Logistics for Conference Call**

The meeting began with a brief welcome by Phil Isenberg, chair of the MLPA Blue Ribbon Task Force. The facilitator, Gail Bingham from RESOLVE, called the roll with 22 members and alternates initially present. MLPA Initiative staff participated in the call, including John Kirlin, Melissa Miller-Henson and Mike Weber. Also present on the call were California Department of Fish and Game MLPA staff Paul Reilly and John Ugoretz. Susan Golding, a member of the Blue Ribbon Task Force, also participated.

**Stakeholder Involvement at January Task Force Meeting**

SIG members were asked about stakeholder involvement at the January Task Force meeting, including what went well, suggestions for changes, and comments on the website. Several participants remarked that the meeting went very well. Other member comments (followed by responses from the initiative staff, where appropriate) included the following:

- It would help to be notified by email when pre-meeting material becomes available on the Web.
- It was good that the task force allowed an opportunity for the public to speak, but it would be helpful to have a better idea of when that opportunity would happen so that working people interested in commenting can time their participation efficiently. Chair Isenberg noted that those who wanted to have input in the process should take advantage of their stakeholder representatives on the SIG as much as possible (otherwise the task force would be overwhelmed trying to hear everyone's concerns in person), that the task force's first obligation was to complete the work before it at each meeting, and that the timing of public comments would have to be subject to that obligation.
- The field trip was an excellent opportunity for interaction with the task force members, but the substance of the interactions was a bit too general (non-specific). It was observed that the discussion would likely become more focused as the task force delves into "the guts" of its work over the next few weeks and months.
- Participants inquired about the audio and video coverage, particularly of the field trip, that was supposed to be on the web. The video portion is important in order to be able to clearly understand who was talking and what was being discussed at the meeting. Initiative staff responded that most of the video should be up on the web now, except the video for the field trip which would take longer because it was more time-consuming to prepare.
- It can be difficult to piece together MLPA information on the Web to create a clear understanding of what is supposed to happen and when. It would be helpful to add a detailed timeline to the MLPA Initiative website.
- The remote locations for live viewing of the meeting were a good idea, but next time, if there are technical difficulties, they should not be permitted to interfere with the flow of the meeting itself.

Thanks were expressed to Chair Isenberg and Fish and Game Director Ryan Broddrick, who took the time to visit the Fred Hall Fishing Tackle and Boat Show in San Francisco.

**February Task Force Meeting**

John Kirlin provided an overview of the upcoming February task force meeting. Key objectives for the

meeting include: (1) selection of central coast project area based on the criteria adopted at the January task force meeting, and (2) review of initial draft language for the master plan framework on design and evaluation of MPAs and MPA networks, and on monitoring and evaluation. Initial thoughts are to have a panel of experts and a panel of stakeholders at the meeting to offer advice to the task force as they consider these issues. These major items would be first on the agenda for the two-day meeting, and additional “housekeeping” items (including budget setting and timelines) would be reserved for the second day.

Staff noted that they were still in the early phases of setting the meeting agenda and that they wanted SIG input as soon as possible, both on the concept of the two panels and on the composition of the panels. Regarding the expert panel, staff specifically asked whether stakeholders would want the task force to hear from scientists in addition to those who might be invited from the MLPA Master Plan Science Advisory Team. General and specific suggestions regarding the make-up of the panel included the following:

- A recent set of recommendations were published and this might be a good source for experts.
- The expert panel should have members that can speak to the status and condition of the resource in the central coast area, as well as management and regulation in the area.
- The panel should have representation from the Monterey Bay Area.
- Specific nominations (from the science team): Rick Starr, Mark Carr, Steven Palumbi, and one of the two economists.
- Specific nominations (not from the science team): John Pearse (Monterey Bay), Dan Pondella, Larry Allen, Rebecca Lent, Richard Parrish, Ralph Larson, Steve Ralston, and Pete Raimondi.

Acknowledging that it was difficult to make recommendations having only received the agenda the night before this call, the initiative staff said it would take additional suggestions by email over the next few days. There was also a brief discussion of nominees for additional members of the science team, in the context of suggesting them also for the expert panel. It was noted that additional nominations had been received and that they were under consideration; a decision on additional members would be announced soon. Chair Isenberg urged the initiative staff to accommodate some of the stakeholders’ suggestions.

SIG members were also asked about the approach to the stakeholder panel – how it should be structured and who should be on it. Many on the call were comfortable with structuring the panel as was done at the first task force meeting, selecting a single representative to represent five broad categories of perspectives: commercial fishing, recreational fishing, diving, conservation, and ports/harbors. Comments about the categories included the suggestion to add municipal government/stormwater perspectives and to be careful to find representatives who appreciate all aspects of these diverse communities. (The point was made about the diving community, but others echoed the sentiment.)

Specific suggestions included:

- Jesus Ruiz
- Someone from the Tidepool Coalition

- Howard Egan (on the MPA working group of the Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary)
- Mike Ricketts, Tom Capen (fishermen)
- Kaitilin Gaffney (conservation)
- Tom Raftican or Ben Sleeter (recreational fishing)

Offers to identify people in specific categories included:

- Someone representing harbors (from Steve Scheiblauber)
- A representative of municipal governments with responsibility for stormwater discharges (from Bobbi Larson)
- A local businessperson (from Karen Garrison, Steve Scheiblauber)

Finally, members were asked for suggestions for a field trip. Members agreed to send their suggestions by email for review by the initiative staff. Steve Scheiblauber extended an invitation to the task force members attending the February 22 meeting to attend a Monday celebration of Monterey Bay (a more formal invitation would be forthcoming).

#### **Process for Stakeholder Comments on the Draft Master Plan Framework**

Mike Weber provided a brief overview of the status and timetable for development of, and comments on, the draft master plan framework (MPF). (See proposed timeline attached at the end of this summary.)

Draft language regarding design and evaluation of MPAs and MPA networks, as well as monitoring and evaluation, will be available soon, in advance of the science team meeting on February 11. Additional draft sections of the MPF will be available after the science team meeting and before the February 22 task force meeting. Staff will accept comments on this first draft until February 25. [Note: this has since been changed to March 1.] A revised version of the MPF will then be available by March 15, with comments on that draft due March 25. A recommended draft master plan framework will be released April 4 for review and adoption at the April 11 task force meeting.

Staff noted that the February draft will still be a work in progress and that comments are very welcome. The staff also said they would try to respond to stakeholder comments in writing (depending on the volume of comments), but at the very least they were planning to use the “track changes” function of a word processing program to provide clear redline/strikeout versions of the draft MPF as it is revised.

Chair Isenberg acknowledged the frustration at the very tight timelines for public and stakeholder review, but noted that the timetable was given to the task force as well and that the MPF needs to be completed as soon as possible. Stakeholders are urged, where possible, to plan meetings of their constituents now with the schedule for reviewing the draft MPF in mind.

Mike Weber expressed willingness to talk with stakeholders about their comments. However, most find email an effective and efficient vehicle of communication.

Chair Isenberg noted that even though the task force will have completed the draft MPF in April, the

Fish and Game Commission will not adopt anything before its meeting in August.

### **Workshops for Applying the Central Coast Project Selection Criteria**

[Note: the term “project area” was changed to “study region” subsequent to this call.]

Two workshops are planned prior to the next task force meeting to gather additional stakeholder input on selecting the central coast project area. The two tentative locations set for these workshops are Morro Bay and either the Santa Rosa or Sausalito area.

Staff noted that the selection of the project boundaries was important enough to warrant these additional workshops in order to (1) review the criteria for determining the boundaries adopted by the task force in January, (2) review the suggested project boundaries received so far, and (3) accept other options that meet the selection criteria. These will be hands-on workshops with maps and GIS projections and will likely last 3-4 hours. The workshops will focus on applying the criteria to possible project boundaries. Approximately 10 suggestions for project boundaries have been received so far, and staff are developing a matrix comparing them. Participants requested that initiative staff make the matrix of suggested project boundaries available as soon as possible in advance of the workshops.

Terminology can be confusing. John Ugoretz clarified that the central coast project area will be a smaller defined area within the larger central coast biogeographic zone described in the MLPA itself, and that the entire project area will not be a marine protected area. Within the project area it is contemplated that there will be the opportunity to describe one or more MPA networks. (Efforts to clarify terminology will be needed for the public to understand exactly what is being discussed in the workshops and at the upcoming task force meeting.)

The meetings will be two of the following three days: February 15, 16, or 17. [Note: subsequent to this call, a third meeting was added.)

Initiative staff asked for input on where the second workshop should be held. One suggestion was to hold three meetings – two at the far ends of the possible range of boundaries for the project and one somewhere in the middle of the region (e.g. Half Moon Bay). Santa Rosa is easier for those coming from the far northern part of the central coast. Sausalito is closer to the centers of population and Santa Cruz. Because the region is large, availability of simultaneous web casting capabilities in selecting a site was urged.

Staff also asked for input on what time of day the meetings should be held. Some participants felt evening meetings were important for improving attendance from those with non-fishing jobs (i.e., beginning after 7:00 p.m.). Other members suggested slightly earlier timeframes (beginning around 6:00 or 6:30 p.m.) and some suggested that meetings should begin much earlier (by 5:00 p.m. at the latest) because commercial fishermen have to get up very early. Only a few had concerns about holding the meeting from 6-9:30 or so.

### **Open Discussion**

The audio tape for the science team meeting where the selection criteria were discussed was very poor.

Staff reported that the audio technician was thrown off by last minute changes in the room configuration and that this would not happen again.

A question was asked about the effect of the new California Ocean Protection Act on the implementation of the MLPA. At least one stakeholder group has submitted a legal opinion on the matter to the task force. Chair Isenberg commented that some aspects of this are decisions for the Resources Agency, and the task force is seeking clarification about how it should respond or react. The task force also does not yet have clarification on the liability issues, which it hopes to get as soon as legal counsel is available.

There was a question regarding the status of maps showing existing closed areas or MPAs. Staff responded that everything that is mappable is mapped, but that some data are difficult to show on a hard copy map (e.g., because the boundaries of some closed areas move according to the season). Staff indicated they did have better maps than had been available from NMFS, however.

#### **Information on Future Meeting Dates**

##### **Task Force Meetings:**

February 22-23	Monterey
April 11-12	TBD
May 23	Sacramento

##### **Science Team Meetings:**

February 11	Oakland
March 23	Oakland

##### **Proposed SIG meetings (by teleconference):**

March 4	1:30-3:30
April 21	1:30-3:30
June 3	1:30-3:30

The March 4 SIG conference call conflicts with the Fred Hall show in Long Beach (where some members have obligations). Staff said they would look into whether it would be possible to have that call from noon to 2:00 pm. It was also suggested that the upcoming Fred Hall and SCUBA shows would make good opportunities for task force members to make public appearances and answer questions. Chair Isenberg stated that the invitation is appreciated and, although they may not always be available, he or other members of the task force (or the executive director) would try to accommodate such requests when possible.

#### **Wrap Up**

The conference call adjourned at 3:45 PM.

**California Marine Life Protection Act Initiative:  
Schedule for Review of the Draft Master Plan Framework  
Revised February 3, 2005**

Over the next two months, the MLPA Blue Ribbon Task Force, the Master Plan Science Advisory Team and stakeholders will be reviewing draft text for the master plan framework. The task force is scheduled to adopt a draft master plan framework at its April 11-12, 2005 meeting, after which the document will be forwarded to the Department of Fish and Game (DFG). DFG will then submit its recommended draft master plan framework for consideration by the Fish and Game Commission over succeeding months. Target dates for discussion and review of the draft master plan framework are as follows:

February 9: Release draft sections of the master plan framework on the design and evaluation of MPAs and MPA networks and on monitoring and evaluation. Begin public comment on these draft sections.

February 11: Review of initial sections at the science team meeting.

February 17: Release of other sections of the draft master plan framework.

February 22: Review of all sections of the draft master plan framework at the task force meeting, solicit input from expert and stakeholder panels, and receive public comment.

March 1: Public comment closes on first draft sections.

March 15: Revised draft master plan framework is released for public comment.

March 23: Review of key sections of the revised draft master plan framework by the science team.

March 25: Public comment closes on revised draft.

April 4: Public release of recommended draft master plan framework.

April 11: The task force reviews and adopts a recommended draft master plan framework after public comment.

April 15: Recommended draft master plan framework is submitted to DFG.

May 23: DFG presents a draft master plan framework to the Fish and Game Commission and public comment is solicited. The Fish and Game Commission process will last several months and will include several opportunities for public comment.

All draft documents will be posted to the MLPA Initiative website as soon as possible after their release. If you have questions or comments on these draft documents, please contact Mike Weber at [Mike.Weber@resources.ca.gov](mailto:Mike.Weber@resources.ca.gov).

**CALIFORNIA MARINE LIFE PROTECTION ACT INITIATIVE**  
**STATEWIDE INTERESTS GROUP**  
**DRAFT MEETING AGENDA**  
**March 4, 2005**  
**12:00 noon – 1:45 p.m. via conference call**

**Call-in information: *Dial toll free 888.887.0127 and enter 833424 at the prompt***

***Meeting Objectives***

- *Debrief central coast workshops*
- *Debrief February task force meeting and stakeholder involvement, including stakeholder panel*
- *Discuss how stakeholder presentations can help task force achieve objective for April meeting*
- *Obtain update on stakeholder comments on draft master plan framework*
- *Share other ideas for strengthening stakeholder involvement and process topics not covered*
- *Updates on future meeting dates (BRTF, SIG and SAT)*
- *Summarize next steps*

- - - - -

- |    |  |                    |
|----|--|--------------------|
| 1. | Welcome, roll call, and logistics for conference call<br><i>Phil Isenberg, MLPA Task Force chair</i><br><i>Gail Bingham, facilitator</i>   | 12:00 – 12:10 p.m. |
| 2. | Recap of central coast workshops   | 12:10 – 12:20 p.m. |
| 3. | Stakeholder involvement at February task force meeting <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- what went well?</li><li>- suggestions for changes (timer, speaker cards, photos)</li><li>- comments on the webcasting, website, potential VTC</li></ul>         | 12:20 – 12:40 p.m. |
| 4. | April task force meeting<br><i>[Key objective is review of revised draft master plan framework]</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- options for focus of expert and stakeholder panels</li><li>- composition of expert and stakeholder panel</li></ul> | 12:40 – 1:10 p.m.  |
| 5. | Update on draft master plan framework status and timetable   | 1:10 – 1:20 p.m.   |
| 6. | Open discussion<br><i>[What topics would you like to address that haven't been asked?]</i>   | 1:20– 1:35 p.m.    |
| 7. | Information on future meeting dates <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- any major events that pose conflicts?</li></ul>  | 1:35 – 1:40 p.m.   |
| 8. | Wrap up <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- action items and next steps</li><li>- suggestions for future SIG agenda items</li></ul>  | 1:40 – 1:45 p.m.   |

**CALIFORNIA MARINE LIFE PROTECTION ACT INITIATIVE  
STATEWIDE INTERESTS GROUP  
MARCH 4, 2005 MEETING SUMMARY  
(12:00 noon - 2:00 p.m. via conference call)**

**Welcome, Roll Call, and Logistics for Conference Call**

The meeting began with a brief welcome by Phil Isenberg, MLPA Blue Ribbon Task Force (BRTF) Chair. The facilitator, Gail Bingham from RESOLVE, called the roll with 23 members present. MLPA Initiative staff also participated in the call, including John Kirlin, MLPA Initiative executive director; Mike Weber, MLPA Initiative senior project manager; and Melissa Miller-Henson, MLPA Initiative operations and communications manager. Also present on the call was John Ugoretz, senior policy advisor to the MLPA Initiative and Rob Williams of RESOLVE.

**Recap of Central Coast Workshops**

John Kirlin thanked the MLPA Statewide Interests Group (SIG) representatives for their support. Although the workshops added significantly to the staff workload, staff felt that it was well worth the effort and helped frame the discussion at the February BRTF meeting. He noted that an additional workshop (three in total) was held in response to suggestions made at the last SIG call. All three meetings were held from 6:00 – 9:00 pm, also as suggested on the last call. The locations, dates, and total number of participants were:

Location	Date	Participants
Bodega	February 15, 2005	38
Santa Cruz	February 16, 2005	64
Morro Bay	February 17, 2005	97

SIG representatives were asked for general comments and impressions about the workshops and provided the following:

- Generally the meetings were well run and received.
- A few workshop participants expressed concern to one of the SIG members that they did not recognize the staff present from the BRTF or the California Department of Fish and Game. These participants felt that their input would be more seriously considered if those they recognized as senior members of these organizations had been present. (The representative making this comment said he didn't necessarily share that view and that he received other favorable impressions of the workshop.) The chair and staff also noted that BRTF members and staff who were not present made the effort to watch the video tapes and asked SIG members to convey this to their constituencies.
- The general public's lack of knowledge about the issue of marine protected areas (MPAs), and the Marine Life Protection Act (MLPA) Initiative in particular, was again evident. This is likely to be unavoidable and perhaps could be planned for with a FAQ handout or summary at the beginning of future workshops of this type.
- The specific terminology "study area" was and continues to be problematic. This contributes to public misunderstanding and questions such as, 'do you not have enough areas to study already?' Different terminology that more accurately conveys intended action to the public would be helpful.

- When participants spoke at length from the heart about a topic, the moderator would fail to record anything, leaving the participant to feel that their input and effort was not valued.
- Though the meetings were well run on balance, there needs to be more of an effort to focus participants on the topic at hand.

### **Stakeholder Involvement at the February BRTF Meeting**

As noted previously, the input from the three workshops played a significant role in helping frame the discussion of the MLPA Central Coast Study Region at BRTF meeting held February 22-23 in Monterey. However, due to unexpected illnesses and mudslide conditions across the state, a quorum was not reached; and a formal decision about the designation of the study region was postponed until the April 11-12 meeting.

SIG representatives were asked for feedback on the BRTF meeting including: a) what went well; b) suggestions for change; and comments on the webcasting, website, and potential for video conferencing (VTC).

SIG members were disappointed that a formal decision about the study region was not made at the February meeting, given the series of workshops and the amount of preparatory work done. Several people asked whether, in similar unusual circumstances, provisions might be made for an alternative method to reach quorum for key decisions in the future (e.g., participation by phone in case of hardship) so that work could be continued and forward momentum could be sustained. Reservations also were expressed concerning the idea of participation by phone, however.

The chair was complemented on the way the meeting was run and his personal commitment to listening to the public, which he showed by staying and listening to such a large number of comments. Some concerns were expressed about managing the time more effectively, with the suggestion that the use of a timing device would relieve the chair from having to cut people off. Staff indicated that this was already planned for the next meeting. Others suggested that the device give a 1 minute and another 30 second warning that would be visible to the participant and the audience. It was also recommended that the participants be requested to line up behind the microphone to enable the chair to gauge the number of people interested in speaking and more effectively manage the process.

SIG representatives made the following additional comments:

- BRTF members asked great questions.
- There was good variety in composition of the panels, and SIG members appreciated hearing from new people.
- The science discussion was particularly engaging and provided an opportunity to focus on critical issues.

- The PowerPoint presentations were particularly helpful and informative; their continued use should be considered.
- The webcast feedback was well received.
- SIG members would have liked time to ask both panels (expert and stakeholder) questions.

The chair asked for thoughts about whether the BRTF will need to reopen public comment and discussion on the designation of the study region at the April meeting. SIG members commented that interested stakeholder groups and the general public have had extensive opportunities to comment, so reopening the discussion would not be a good use of time. Most members thought that it would be constructive to allocate about an hour to the topic of the study region at the beginning of the BRTF meeting, with a supplemental memo from staff reprising the issues and comments received and a representative stakeholder panel to summarize key points. SIG members agreed to coordinate the selection of panel members (e.g. among the recreational fishing community).

### **April Task Force Meeting**

SIG members were asked to comment on what the focus of the expert and stakeholder panels should be at the upcoming April BRTF meeting. John Ugoretz noted that the principal focus of the meeting would be on the master plan framework. John reported that two issues have come up frequently in comments received, and that providing an opportunity for the BRTF to hear more about these issues from experts and stakeholders might assist them in making decisions. The first issue is the meaning of the concept of a “network” of MPAs and the variety of ways to design and implement such a network. The second issue was to discuss the gradations of restrictions of use and what would be the relationship between the different types of MPAs (no take reserves, recreation only, and limited take conservation areas). This discussion could address when to use which kinds, how they are used, and how they relate spatially.

SIG members commented on the usefulness of both topics and suggested a few others. Two related issues that might best be dealt with in the future (perhaps in the context of the MLPA Central Coast Project) were: 1) indirect impacts (e.g. from land-based pollution); what are they and how the MLPA process will address them, and 2) location of ports and harbors and the interaction with MPAs. Other topics suggested included socio-economic impacts, the benefits of MPAs, and the issue of displaced effort. The chair asked staff to begin working on a conceptual understanding of the varying levels of protection (gradations of use), expanding it to include a suggestion to consider management options in addition to MPAs. This discussion can begin in April but will be worked on iteratively for future meetings. The chair also suggested that this topic of varying levels of protection could usefully be the subject of a workshop after the April meeting.

Based on this discussion, there will be a single focus for the expert and stakeholder panels on the topic of networks.

SIG members were also invited to make suggestions regarding the composition of the expert and stakeholder panel. MLPA staff agreed to email a reminder to all representatives soliciting suggestions for the panels and detailing desirable qualities/expertise for panelists, and requested that suggestions be received by March 9. Additional specific suggestions for the expert panel included:

- representative from NOAA
- pollution expert
- larval transport expert
- social scientist / socio-economist

The stakeholder panel will be constituted as in the past, with about five individuals representing the broad categories of stakeholder interests. SIG members noted the value of varying the particular representative each time.

### **Update on Draft Master Plan Framework Status and Timetable**

Mike Weber reported that over 275 comments were received regarding the MLPA Master Plan Framework (MPF). Major topics that frequently came up, in addition to the issue of the definition of networks, included: land-sea interaction, places that seemed to suggest an anti-fishing bias, and ways to organize the text more clearly including flow charts depicting who is responsible for which decisions.

The current timetable for the MPF is as follows:

March 15	Target for revised draft (showing changes)
March 23	Master Plan Science Advisory Team meeting
March 25	Comments due on revised draft
April 5	Distribute final draft
April 11	BRTF meeting and a decision

### **Open Discussion**

The following comments were made during the open discussion:

- It would be useful to have a discussion of what the specific process is for moving from various proposals to a final MPA designation.
- The broadcast technology is helpful and appreciated.
- The Aquarium of the Pacific and the Monterey Bay Aquarium are discussing approaches to general public education related to MPAs.
- A consideration and discussion of field trips would be useful.

## **Information on Future Meeting Dates**

### *Blue Ribbon Task Force Meetings*

April 11-12                Los Angeles area  
May 23                    Sacramento

### *Master Plan Science Advisory Team Meetings*

March 23                Oakland

### *Proposed SIG meetings (by teleconference)*

April 21                1:30-3:30  
June 3                 1:30-3:30

## **Wrap Up**

The conference call adjourned at 3:45 PM.

**CALIFORNIA MARINE LIFE PROTECTION ACT INITIATIVE  
STATEWIDE INTERESTS GROUP  
DRAFT MEETING AGENDA  
April 21, 2005  
1:30 – 3:30 p.m. via conference call**

**Call-in information: *Dial toll free 888.887.0127 and enter 833424 at the prompt***

**Meeting Objectives**

- *Discuss central coast process, including regional stakeholder group*
- *Discuss how presentations can help task force achieve objective for future meetings*
- *Debrief April task force meeting and stakeholder involvement, including stakeholder panels*
- *Share other ideas for strengthening stakeholder involvement and process topics not covered*
- *Updates on future meeting dates (BRTF, SIG, SAT and CCRSG)*
- *Summarize next steps*

— — — — —

- |    |   |                  |
|----|---|------------------|
| 1. | Welcome, roll call, and logistics for conference call<br><i>Phil Isenberg, MLPA Task Force chair</i><br><i>Gail Bingham, facilitator</i>  | 1:30 – 1:40 p.m. |
| 2. | Central Coast Project <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- timeline</li><li>- regional stakeholder group(s), size, makeup</li></ul>  | 1:40 – 2:00 p.m. |
| 3. | Future task force meetings <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- options for focus of panels and presentations</li></ul>  | 2:00 – 2:40 p.m. |
| 4. | Stakeholder involvement at April task force meeting <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- what went well?</li><li>- suggestions for changes</li><li>- comments on the webcasting, website</li></ul> | 2:40 – 3:00 p.m. |
| 5. | Open discussion <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- what topics would you like to address that haven't been asked?</li></ul>  | 3:00– 3:15 p.m.  |
| 6. | Information on future meeting dates (see below) <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- any major events that pose conflicts?</li></ul>   | 3:15 – 3:25 p.m. |
| 7. | Wrap up <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- action items and next steps</li><li>- suggestions for future SIG agenda items</li></ul>   | 3:25 – 3:30 p.m. |

**CALIFORNIA MARINE LIFE PROTECTION ACT INITIATIVE  
STATEWIDE INTERESTS GROUP  
APRIL 21, 2005 MEETING SUMMARY  
(1:30 – 3:30 p.m. via conference call)**

**Acronyms used:** California Department of Fish and Game (DFG), Marine Life Protection Act (MLPA), MLPA Blue Ribbon Task Force (BRTF), MLPA Central Coast Project (CCP), MLPA Master Plan Framework (MPF), MLPA Master Plan Science Advisory Team (SAT), MLPA Statewide Interests Group (SIG), marine protected area (MPA)

**Welcome, Roll Call, and Logistics for Conference Call**

The meeting began with a brief welcome by Phil Isenberg, chair of the MLPA Blue Ribbon Task Force. He thanked everyone who participated in the Pasadena and Monterey meetings, and he looks forward to building upon the work that was accomplished. The facilitator, Gail Bingham from RESOLVE, called the roll before the meeting began. Among the attendees on the call were, MLPA Initiative staff John Kirlin and Melissa Miller-Henson. Also present was DFG staff John Ugoretz.

**Central Coast Project**

MLPA Initiative Executive Director John Kirlin introduced Michael DeLapa as the new Central Coast Project Manager for the California Marine Life Protection Act Initiative. John Kirlin emphasized the good management skills and personal relationships that Mike DeLapa brings to the MLPA Initiative. John Kirlin mentioned that the MLPA Master Plan Framework is a better document due to the edits completed by BRTF members, and that staff are ready to launch the MLPA Central Coast Project (CCP). Mike DeLapa added that the CCP will involve stakeholders in a meaningful way once a team is established.

***Timeline***

Mike DeLapa spoke about the CCP and the challenges the project will face. The ambitious work plan was discussed, which involves an intense seven month period with a January 2006 due date to submit findings to the BRTF. This January due date forces regional work to be done during December 2005. The commitment was made to engage with the stakeholders involving workshops, meetings with video and audio, and documents on the web. This will lead to an open process, with the variety of stakeholders to share information with everyone.

***Size & Makeup of Regional Stakeholder Group***

John Kirlin asked Mike DeLapa what he was specifically looking for in the regional stakeholder groups. Mike DeLapa, noting the short time frame, responded that he wants the stakeholder groups to examine the region as a whole. He further explained that he is gravitating towards having two groups: consumptive and non-consumptive, incorporating people with knowledge of fisheries. Tentatively meetings would take place once a month with communication between meetings. This communication between meetings would also include workshops for people in outlying areas to participate.

Mike DeLapa went on to further explain why having two subgroups working with the consumptive and non-consumptive groups would slow down the process. Having subgroups would double the workload for staff with twice as many meetings to cover all the information. He further explained that with trying to complete regional project work by August 2005, there simply was not enough time.

When the CCP regional stakeholder groups are in place, a question arose regarding frequency of meetings with the stakeholder groups. Chair Isenberg and Mike DeLapa stated that their understanding was two meetings a month for the stakeholder groups with workshops. MLPA Initiative staff, John Kirlin and Melissa Miller-Henson both suggested that one meeting a month with alternating cites might be more affective. Melissa Miller-Henson added that one meeting per month of the regional subgroups for regional idea sharing would also be conducive.

More specifically, the topic of dual north and south representatives in the stakeholder group was brought up for discussion along with the frequency of their meetings. With dual north and south representatives, there will be one person representing two or three fisheries, and in addition there would also be three or four people generally involved representing Morro Bay and Monterey.

Regarding the number of meetings of the north and south representatives, many options were discussed. The meeting models discussed were:

- One group meeting once a month which would equal to 6 meetings, either one or two days in length.
- One group meeting plus subgroup meetings regionally.
- Two groups meetings with workshops to work closely with the consumptive and non-consumptive groups.

Comments were made on the two groups meeting model stating that two groups work better in zeroing in on specific areas, and the melding of the information of the two groups would be a straightforward process. A hybrid of the meetings was also suggested where melding of information would be done at the beginning, when both groups get together to discuss, and then later the big groups would break up into regional subgroups. Chairman Isenberg stated that a single group makes sense, but in order for them to be affective, the representatives must be scattered across the region. Additional comments made by SIG members suggested that one group will place emphasis on continuity where goals and objectives are emphasized and established.

Chair Isenberg emphasized the need to do a community profile, set goals, how to meet the goals of community profiling, and find a way to see what the alternate networks will look like. He wet on to state that a group that is familiar with the process and the California state law needs to be organized.

John Kirlin shared that the number of meetings of the stakeholder groups has not been finally decided, and that everyone will need to come to some decision that will work for all parties involved.

Facilitator, Gail Bingham from RESOLVE summarized a list of concerns:

1. Time devoted to meetings
2. Time between meetings to work on areas/problems
3. Ways to phase process

John Kirlin acknowledged the aforementioned three as the main concerns, and added the need for more regional participation and that resources be made available to the different stakeholders. As members are considered for the CCP stakeholder group, test and look at nominees to examine their history of participation, and what their knowledge is via their involvement. The timeline for nominees will end Monday, April 25, 2005. After the nominations are collected there will be a conference call scheduled to make decisions on the prospective nominees.

### **Future Task Force Meetings**

- May 23 - Sacramento
- July 11-12 – location TBA
- September 28-29 – location TBA
- November 29-30 – location TBA
- January task force meeting – location TBA

General comments on the meetings: For the July meeting, a socio-economist was asked to speak as well as a speaker on marine reserves and diver information. A SIG member expressed a need for two panels, one on diver observations in MPAs, and a second expert panel on predator-prey relations.

### **Open Discussion**

Maps: Suggested to be done with nautical charts with overlays so everyone better understands what is being discussed regionally.

September's BBRTF meeting is scheduled to take place in Morro Bay.

Stakeholder groups versus the SIG: The stakeholder groups are more involved with developing MPA's whereas the SIG is more specifically to assist the BRTF with process.

MPF: An evolving process, and there are concerns regarding the document. John Kirlin made suggestions on how the changes will be handled. There will be two meetings with public input, and then the BRTF will revisit the issues regarding the MPF.

### **Stakeholder Involvement at April BRTF Meeting**

Melissa Miller-Henson stated that the Cal Poly offsite videoconferencing did not work well at all. The room was reported as being too small, and the discussions could not be heard. The videoconferencing won't be considered again until staff is convinced it will work.

### **Wrap up**

The MLPA website will be redesigned for easier navigation of documents. The new BRTF meeting dates will be up on the website by the end of the week as well as upcoming SIG meeting dates. Possible conference dates for SIG are: July 20, October 7 and December 7. A SAT meeting was also announced for May 11 in Oakland. Confirmation was made of the May 23 and June 3 conference calls.

The conference call adjourned at 3:23 p.m.

**California Marine Life Protection Act Initiative**  
**Statewide Interests Group**  
**Draft Meeting Agenda**  
**June 3, 2005**  
**1:30 – 3:30 p.m. via conference call**

**Call-in information: *Dial toll free 888.887.0127 and enter 833424 at the prompt***

**Meeting Objectives**

- *Receive update on central coast process*
  - *Discuss how additional science presentations can help task force and regional stakeholder group achieve objectives for future meetings*
  - *Debrief May task force meeting with Fish and Game Commission*
  - *Share other ideas for strengthening stakeholder involvement and process topics not specifically covered on other agenda items*
  - *Updates on future meeting dates (BRTF, SIG, SAT and CCRSG)*
  - *Summarize next steps*
- — — — —

- |    |   |                  |
|----|---|------------------|
| 1. | Welcome, roll call, and logistics for conference call<br><i>Phil Isenberg, MLPA Task Force chair</i><br><i>Gail Bingham, facilitator</i>  | 1:30 – 1:40 p.m. |
| 2. | Update on the Central Coast Project <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- membership</li><li>- date and agenda for first meeting</li><li>- questions?</li></ul>   | 1:40 – 1:50 p.m. |
| 3. | Focus of future science presentations (see next page) <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- at Blue Ribbon Task Force meetings</li><li>- at the Central Coast Regional Stakeholder Group meetings</li></ul> | 1:50 – 2:35 p.m. |
| 4. | May task force meeting with Fish and Game Commission <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- what went well?</li><li>- suggestions for changes</li></ul>  | 2:35 – 2:50 p.m. |
| 5. | Open discussion <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- what topics would you like to address that haven't been asked?</li></ul>  | 2:50 – 3:15 p.m. |
| 6. | Confirmation of future meeting dates (see last page)  | 3:15 – 3:20 p.m. |
| 7. | Wrap up <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- action items and next steps</li><li>- suggestions for future SIG agenda items</li></ul>   | 3:20 – 3:30 p.m. |

**CALIFORNIA MARINE LIFE PROTECTION ACT INITIATIVE  
STATEWIDE INTERESTS GROUP  
JUNE 3, 2005 MEETING SUMMARY  
(1:30 - 3:30 p.m. via conference call)**

**SIG members present:** Carol Abella, Dan Berman, Don Canestro, Tom Capen, James Colston, Karen Garrison, Vern Goehring, Joel Greenberg, Zeke Grader, Nancy Hastings, Bill James, Corrine Monroe, Tom Raftican, Jesús Ruiz, Steve Scheiblauber, David Whittington, Dan Wolford

**Others present:** Phil Isenberg (Chair, MLPA Blue Ribbon Task Force), Gail Bingham (facilitator, RESOLVE, Inc.), John Kirlin (MLPA Initiative staff), Maura Leos (notetaker, DFG staff), Melissa Miller-Henson (MLPA Initiative staff), Dave Parker, (DFG staff), John Ugoretz (DFG staff), April Wakeman (as an observer for United Anglers of Southern California), Michael Weber (MLPA Initiative staff)

**Acronyms used:** California Department of Fish and Game (DFG), California Fish and Game Commission (F&GC), Marine Life Protection Act (MLPA), MLPA Blue Ribbon Task Force (BRTF), MLPA Central Coast Regional Stakeholder Group (CCRSG), MLPA Master Plan Framework (MPF), MLPA Master Plan Science Advisory Team (SAT), MLPA Statewide Interests Group (SIG), marine protected area (MPA)

### **Welcome, Roll Call, and Logistics for Conference Call**

Melissa Miller-Henson apologized to everyone for a correction to the MLPA master calendar. The December 13 conference call will actually be held on December 15.

Gail Bingham, the facilitator, asked for any additions to the agenda. One SIG member asked for discussion of the socio-economic aspects of the MLPA. Bill James stated his dissatisfaction with the lack of timeliness of the agenda; three days was not enough time to discuss the issues with his constituents. John Kirlin requested that Tom Raftican's proposal be added to agenda item 3.

### **Update on the Central Coast Process**

The membership of the regional stakeholder group, draft agenda for the June 8-9, 2005 meeting in Monterey, and meeting packet (excluding charter and ground rule) have all been sent to SIG members and posted on the MLPA website.

A SIG member asked how agreement will be reached. The answer was that the charter speaks to this question. Staff is not expecting the group to come to a single alternative, nor are there expectations of consensus right away.

Another SIG member asked whether alternatives will be weighted and whether there will be a minimum number of votes that are needed for an alternative to move forward. The answer was "no" to both questions: *any* alternative will be considered. The stakeholder group will figure out the focus.

One SIG member expressed the opinion that it is imperative to list the weighting of each alternative and who is putting forth each alternative. This SIG member would also like to see the number of votes that each alternative receives. MLPA Initiative staff responded that there is no mechanical vehicle for creating alternatives. Alternatives will be fully recorded and the group will be able to carry forth any proposal.

One SIG member wanted to get a quick reaction of those who are on both the SIG and the CCRSG regarding the facilitation contractor, CONCUR. The three duplicate members were all favorably impressed with how bright, skilled, sincere, open-minded, and knowledgeable in fishery topics were the CONCUR contractors.

Another SIG member asked, since they hadn't seen the ground rules, about "dinging" alternative suggestions and requiring that an alternative be put on the table to meet objectives. The answer to this question was that the ground rules are not phrased in this way, though the effect will be the same. Staff is hoping for interaction of unanimity and positive attitude from the stakeholders.

### **Focus of Future Science Presentations**

Since Chair Isenberg was not yet in the meeting, John Ugoretz requested that the portion of the discussion regarding the focus of future science presentations be delayed. He realized the agenda had been distributed late and understood the need to have time to digest the accompanying science team information before a lengthy discussion could happen. He suggested that SIG members discuss Tom Raftican's proposal for a joint science team and stakeholder workshop and the May BRTF meeting while waiting for Chair Isenberg to join the call.

### **Stakeholder Sponsored Workshop**

Tom Raftican put forth a proposal for a workshop where the science team and stakeholders would meet and work out some of the concerns regarding the science team's advice on ideas such as the network concept, larval transfer, and the goals and objectives for the MLPA Central Coast Study Region. This would be a two-day workshop in the Monterey/Watsonville area consisting of anywhere from 50 to 100 attendees that would break out into study groups. Tom Raftican stated that he would like suggestions on who should be on the panels. The BRTF supports this concept and will offer funds to assist. An outline and possible facilitator is expected to be ready in two weeks. This proposal is mainly for SIG members' information at this time; United Anglers will be contacting everyone later concerning their involvement.

Extensive discussion followed Tom Raftican's proposal.

One member stated that there needs to be stakeholder involvement in the proposed workshop; it cannot be one sided. Is this proposed workshop going to replace the hearings the F&GC is planning or is it an addition to the hearings? Will this information go to the BRTF as well as the F&GC? Is there going to be a single presentation or more? The answer to these questions was

that United Anglers would like to schedule this workshop between meetings and hearings in an attempt to get more well-rounded dialogue. The timing is crucial and Tom Raftican will be in contact with the F&GC. The document produced from the workshop will go to both the BRTF and the F&GC.

There was some general concern about the practicality of getting people involved with yet more meetings. Do people have to come twice? John Kirlin stated that the MLPA staff would be willing to join efforts. There will be single events or a reduced number of events as well as the use of other methods, such as the website and the AGP videotaping, to reduce demands on time.

A SIG member asked what the timing for the workshop would be. Don't be in a rush; an adequate amount of time is extremely important. The entire process needs to be done well, not fast. This stakeholder would like to see the process slow down. MLPA staff answered that likely the workshop would have to be either somewhere between July 19 and July 25 (actually too early) or between July 26 and Aug 9.

A SIG member expressed concern that the proposed workshop would be an open meeting. There was also concern over constraints of space and timing. The current meeting dates in July are pretty intense. MLPA staff answered that the meeting would be open for observation and that, regarding timing, AGP Video would be involved so there would be a video and audio record to review.

Another SIG member wanted to know who the target audience for the workshop information is. How does the workshop fit into what is already going on? Would there be one set from the BRTF and another from the F&GC? They have different perspectives. Also, how would the workshop fit with the F&GC hearings? Would there be duplication? MLPA staff answered that the F&GC is holding three hearings to discuss the MPF which will be in the later half of July. These hearings are designed for the F&GC to hear strictly from the public.

A SIG member suggested that the MLPA staff make sure there is someone from "the other side of the fence." There needs to be good strong voices from each segment of the stakeholders.

A SIG member wondered if it makes sense for stakeholders to be putting together these workshops. The SAT should be the main presenters to all groups, which creates a common ground. The scientists should be advising not advocating.

There was another question regarding who is the target audience and whether the topics are already set. Are we spreading this out over months or doing it all in a couple of days? Are we looking at general information or specific science?

At this point, Tom Raftican and April Wakeman responded, "Neither." Scientists should give input; they are not policy makers. Policy derived from science flows and takes into

consideration stakeholders' needs. This is a worthy topic of discussion after the SAT input and the stakeholder forum. The indicated a hope to illuminate the network concept.

A SIG member stated that a majority of the SAT members are not necessarily balanced; they are very busy doing other things. There still needs to be a vetting of science in a balanced forum and this process may need to be delayed in order to get the right people. The science really needs to come out. Bob Treanor really needs to be included in all of these meetings.

At this point there was a reiteration of the purpose of this proposal. Tom Raftican wants to make sure all the questions are on the table. This workshop is expected to fill a need made apparent at the F&GC/BRTF meeting in May. The workshop would not be doing the science, but measuring science and policy. The science panel needs to be a part of this process as well as the BRTF and F&GC. The timelines are short, but the F&GC will be voting on this process in August, and that is too soon. We need to bring in a different perspective. There needs to be discussion about networks so the F&GC can vote.

### **Focus of Future Science Presentations**

There was concern over the lateness of receiving the agenda. There is a need to get questions about science addressed by the scientists. Get these questions to a working group, then to the BRTF and F&GC now.

Some members felt the SAT should not be in charge of the presentations. The presentations should be produced by a team that can flesh out what's right and fair, and can present a point-counterpoint presentation. Another member was concerned about the way the presentations will be structured. This process needs to be open and transparent. Especially with regard to financing since there will be contracting involved.

John Ugoretz commented that he realized the list of possible topics provided by the SAT for these workshop presentations came to SIG members late. He would like input on the list of topics, but urged members to give themselves time to digest the information before commenting. Any recommendations and comments can be posted to the SIG listserv. However, please do not participate in back and forth discussion with each other on the listserv as this is not a debate.

Chair Isenberg reminded SIG members that the BRTF has its own timetable based on its mandates and the F&GC schedule. The BRTF is indeed interested in hearing what the SIG members have to say.

A member expressed concern there is not enough socio-economic study in the process. There are questions on what species need to be identified. There needs to be different points of view presented. There also should be point-counterpoint discussions in order to hear dissenting scientific opinions.

A member commented the socio-economic study done for the Channel Islands process was flawed. There is concern this process will repeat those flaws.

A concern about the scientists acting as advocates was repeated.

Another member expressed concerns over the socio-economic impacts of MPAs and was disappointed that economics was not in the list of topics provided by the SAT for possible presentations. This SIG member would like to see some pro-business scientists.

**Action Item:** Members of the SIG are to take a closer look at the SAT proposed topics and then reflect on Chair Isenberg's questions. Are they the right questions and in the right order? The SIG members are asked to use the listserv for comments and recommendations with NO debate. This is to be completed no later than Friday, June 10, 2005. In addition, SIG members should include other names for potential presenters.

Chair Isenberg adjourned the call.

**California Marine Life Protection Act Initiative  
Statewide Interests Group  
Draft Meeting Agenda  
July 20, 2005  
2:00 p.m. via conference call**

**Call-in information: *Dial toll free 888.887.0127 and enter 833424 at the prompt***

**Meeting Objectives**

- *Receive update on central coast process*
  - *Identify process and ground rules for submitting MPA proposals*
  - *Discuss additional science presentations*
  - *Debrief July task force meeting*
  - *Share other ideas for strengthening stakeholder involvement and process topics not specifically covered on other agenda items*
  - *Updates on future meeting dates (BRTF, SIG, SAT and CCRSG)*
  - *Summarize next steps*
- - - - -

- |    |   |                  |
|----|---|------------------|
| 1. | Welcome, roll call, and logistics for conference call<br><i>Phil Isenberg, MLPA Task Force chair</i><br><i>Gail Bingham, facilitator</i>  | 2:00 – 2:10 p.m. |
| 2. | Update on the Central Coast Project <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- membership</li><li>- dates and locations of meetings</li><li>- data gathering</li><li>- submitting MPA designs into the MLPA process (see next page)</li><li>- questions?</li></ul> | 2:10 – 2:30 p.m. |
| 3. | Science presentations (see page three) <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- at Blue Ribbon Task Force meetings</li><li>- at the Central Coast Regional Stakeholder Group meetings</li><li>- stakeholder sponsored workshops?</li></ul>                       | 2:30 – 3:00 p.m. |
| 4. | July task force meeting <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- what went well?</li><li>- suggestions for changes</li></ul>   | 3:00 – 3:15 p.m. |
| 5. | Open discussion <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- what topics would you like to address that haven't been asked?</li></ul>  | 3:15 – 3:30 p.m. |
| 6. | Potential changes to future meeting dates (see last page)   | 3:30 – 3:40 p.m. |
| 7. | Wrap up <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- action items and next steps</li><li>- suggestions for future SIG agenda items</li></ul>   | 3:40 – 3:45 p.m. |

**CALIFORNIA MARINE LIFE PROTECTION ACT INITIATIVE  
STATEWIDE INTERESTS GROUP  
JULY 20, 2005 MEETING SUMMARY  
(2:00-3:45 p.m. via conference call)**

**SIG members present:** Steve Campi, James Colston, Don Canestro, Kevin Cooper, Dr. Ronald Fritzsche, Karen Garrison, Vern Goehring, Zeke Grader, Joel Greenberg, Nancy Hastings, Jim Martin, Mike Osmond, Tom Raftican, Jesús Ruiz, Linda Sheehan, Erin Simmons, Ben Sleeter, David Whittington

**Others present:** Jack Peveler (listening for Carol Abella), Phil Isenberg (Chair, MLPA Blue Ribbon Task Force), Gail Bingham (Facilitator), Michael DeLapa (MLPA Initiative staff), Maura Leos (notetaker, DFG staff), Melissa Miller-Henson (MLPA Initiative staff), John Ugoretz (DFG staff), Michael Weber (MLPA Initiative staff)

**Acronyms used:** California Department of Fish and Game (DFG), California Fish and Game Commission (F&GC), geographic information system (GIS), MLPA Blue Ribbon Task Force (BRTF), MLPA Central Coast Regional Stakeholder Group (CCRSG), MLPA Master Plan Framework (MPF), MLPA Master Plan Science Advisory Team (SAT), marine protected area (MPA)

## **Welcome**

Gail Bingham, facilitator from RESOLVE, welcomed everyone and reviewed the agenda and meeting objectives. There were no questions regarding the agenda. Four SIG members asked to raise issues in the open discussion.

## **Update on the Central Coast Regional Stakeholder Group (CCRSG)**

Michael DeLapa reported on the progress of the CCRSG. The group has made good progress and put together a mass of information. It is a great team, on schedule and on budget. There are 32 primary members with 9 members of the SAT as a science sub-team. The CCRSG has already met twice with another meeting scheduled in Monterey on August 10-11, 2005. Some work teams have been formed to deal with goals and objectives, mapping, and socio-economic data.

The CCRSG has a detailed work plan and project schedule. The website is being redesigned and built in a form to track questions and issues. The CCRSG adopted some regional goals with the prospect of adopting provisional objectives at its next meeting for the BRTF to review in September. The second draft of the MLPA Central Coast Regional Profile will be brought to the CCRSG at its August meeting. A number of research contracts have been initiated including: two socio-economic studies, one by Dr. Astrid Scholtz and one by Dr. Linwood Pendleton; a data visualization project by IM Systems; and a non-consumptive study by Chris LaFranche. Next steps are to complete the regional profile, set some regional objectives, evaluate existing MPAs and inventory possible new areas. A package of alternatives should be ready for the BRTF by October or November.

## **Questions**

A SIG member had a question regarding the upcoming CCRSG meeting in September in Morro Bay. Will the group break out into the two regional groups or remain as one? MLPA Initiative Staff answered that the first day will be a collective meeting. The second day the group may break into two regional groups or even back into the small working groups. The specific arrangement for the meeting will be decided later.

The same SIG member wondered how the word will get out regarding GIS layers. How will the public and those not able to attend meetings access and use the mapping site? MLPA Initiative staff answered that the idea was to have these tools available to the stakeholders at the meetings. There will be GIS staff at each meeting to assist. The site has been announced at each meeting. This data is important to understand and the GIS staff and website are reference tools. The site can be difficult to navigate. There won't be a lot of outreach to people outside of the stakeholder group. However, stakeholders can learn at meetings and then assist their constituents.

A SIG member wanted to know who the members of the science sub-team were for the CCRSG. MLPA Initiative staff answered that Mark Carr and Dean Wendt are the primary members with Rick Starr and Linwood Pendleton as their alternates. There are also two graduate students assisting the SAT. Also, Steve Palumbi, Doyle Hanan, Steve Gaines, Loo Botsford, and Mary Yoklavich volunteered to assist the CCRSG.

Another SIG member wondered if it was still possible to submit comments on the regional profile, and if people outside the CCRSG were able to submit comments. MLPA Initiative staff answered that they certainly will accept any comments submitted. There is a quick turn around for this project so staff urged comments to be made in a timely manner. The next draft should be to the CCRSG members by the 2<sup>nd</sup> of August to be discussed at the meeting on the 10<sup>th</sup>. There will be another round of comments with a deadline of August 17. There is definitely still time to comment.

A SIG member asked whether the GIS tool allows for negotiation further down the road. Will stakeholders be able to compare and pick and choose what aspects they want in an MPA? MLPA Initiative staff answered that the current GIS tool does not allow this kind of comparison. This function is something that can be used in meetings, not online, to show what will happen if an area is closed. Stakeholders will be able to determine some socio-economic impacts from the decision support tool. However, it will only compare total closure to no closure.

At this point, John Ugoretz interjected that people outside the process have been invited to submit proposals. These proposals would have to be consistent with Appendix F of the MPF. These outside proposals would then be evaluated based on the MPF guidelines.

A SIG member wanted to know if the outside proposals could be individual MPA proposals or would they need to be an entire package. He was afraid this could open up a can of worms

with single MPA proposals being submitted. Staff answered that he should review Appendix F, because it will probably address his concerns.

A SIG member asked if there was a way to deal with suggested revisions to the key outcomes memo from the CCRSG meeting. MLPA Initiative staff answered that such revisions need to be submitted directly to the facilitators with a copy to Michael DeLapa.

### **Future Science Presentations**

John Ugoretz reported on the SAT science module presentations. The questions raised during the last conference call were forwarded to the SAT. The SAT organized the presentations and tried to keep a logical order. The three modules presented at the BRTF meeting in Santa Barbara will be presented again at the next CCRSG meeting. This will be the way the modules will be presented. MLPA Initiative staff had hoped to combine some of the BRTF and CCRSG meetings so the SAT would not have to give duplicate presentations, but it did not work out. The SAT is in the process of preparing the next four modules to be presented to the BRTF.

### **Discussion**

One SIG member stated the presenters did an excellent job of expressing the complexity of these issues; however, they also left the BRTF grappling with trying to figure out success and failure. It would be a good idea if the presenters could include how to determine success and failure in the presentations. MLPA Initiative staff answered that success and failure will be covered in the monitoring and evaluation modules. These issues are part of the overall management issue.

A SIG member felt the need to look for a more balanced economist. He indicated that he would have a list of names by the end of the week to propose. John Ugoretz responded that Commissioner Rogers (F&GC) indicated that he would like to have a business economist involved; DFG is looking for such an individual. Staff is bringing in non-SAT scientists to work with the SAT on the presentations. If anyone has suggestions, they can be made to John Ugoretz or John Kirlin.

A SIG member suggested, instead of bringing in an additional economist, give Linwood Pendleton the opportunity to address any concerns.

### **Stakeholder Sponsored Workshop**

Tom Raftican reported on a proposed United Anglers of Southern California-sponsored science workshop. There is a problem with the timeline; United Anglers would like to have the workshop sometime toward the end of September. They are definitely going to go forward with the workshop because of concerns about the definition of network and larval transport, as well as funding. United Anglers would like to invite anyone who is interested to join in shaping the questions and to work out the timing.

A SIG member asked who is the audience for the workshop. The answer was, "first the SIG, then ultimately the BRTF."

Another SIG member expressed that, while this is an important issue, they would like to see it happen within the context of the current schedule of meetings.

MLPA staff and Chair Isenberg indicated an appreciation for both concerns of audience and timing. Discussion of these issues will indeed take place at the upcoming BRTF meetings.

Tom Raftican suggested that anyone who wants to propose scientists to participate in the workshop is encouraged to get the names to United Anglers as soon as possible. Be assured, everyone will see the end product.

A SIG member stated that he felt there needed to be additional scientists with different views at the workshop.

Facilitator Bingham reminded the group of the short time window for any suggested topics or scientists to participate in the presentation. For those who feel there is still a need to plan an additional workshop it will be towards the end of September and will be inclusive of all scientists. Contact Tom Raftican if you are interested in helping to shape questions or work on the timing.

A SIG member took this opportunity to recommend to John Ugoretz a topic on data availability and uncertainty.

Another SIG member asked about bringing in another economist. He was concerned there wouldn't be point-counter-point. The answer was "no," if another economist is brought in, it will be a collaborative effort.

### **July BRTF Meeting**

Melissa Miller-Henson reported that the last BRTF meeting was held in Santa Barbara on July 11-12. A number of SIG members attended. The BRTF returned to an earlier format with a field trip Monday afternoon. As usual, the meeting was videotaped and webcast. Tuesday afternoon, the F&GC held a hearing to take public comment on the MPF. One thing staff learned was that five days of back-to-back meetings was not conducive to sanity.

### **Open Discussion**

Ben Sleeter asked if a GIS scientist could be added to the SAT; he would prefer someone with a Ph.D. He will send some suggested names to John Ugoretz and John Kirlin. MLPA staff indicated that Dr. Will McClintock attended the last CCRSG meeting and is working with staff and the SAT. He is not a member of the SAT, but is an analyst and interpreter.

Zeke Grader asked about using the KRIS program that is used for north coast watersheds, which could serve as an excellent template for MLPA.

Karen Garrison asked how the stakeholders are going to integrate affordability into the process; that issues should be looked at now. MLPA staff answered that the BRTF is indeed looking at the numbers now; the cost won't be known until staff actually start building the framework. At this point it is all rather nebulous. In the end, this thing DOES need to be paid for.

Linda Sheehan asked, about a tangentially related issue, if MLPA staff wanted information regarding agriculture water piped to Point Alero. If desired, MLPA staff should e-mail Ms. Sheehan. This is an issue that keeps coming back.

Joel Greenberg had some latent questions. How is the redesign progressing on the website? Is there a timeframe? MLPA staff answered that staff is reviewing the proposed architecture of the website now, which will then go back to the contractor after staff review. A functioning product should be ready by the end of August.

A SIG member asked if the public can expect to see published public comments on the regional profile. The MLPA staff answered that they haven't been published yet, but will be in the future.

### **GIS Mapping and Tools for Comparing Network Alternatives**

Michael DeLapa reported there are two different tools for GIS mapping available. Staff is able to access raw data layers and best readily available science. Contractors are developing a separate tool that is not web based; this tool will allow polygons to be drawn with quantitative data. The tool will be available at CCRSG meetings, and is similar to the Oceans Map.

Some SIG members felt what is available now is nowhere near ready to be made public. The available technology is not a tool for decision making. The tool is not interactive. All members need training on using these datasets to ensure that the wrong conclusions are not drawn. Being able to see the existing closures and defacto layers is an excellent tool.

Michael DeLapa indicated that these concerns are all part of what will be addressed over the next five months.

One SIG member asked if there had been a panel set up with the SAT to review outside alternatives. There was concern that the SAT will review the alternative package going to the F&GC and that it will not be altered between the time it goes from the CCRSG to the F&GC. MLPA Initiative staff answered that, no, outside alternatives will be presented to the stakeholder group as a whole. The selection of an alternative will be a process happening concurrently not linearly.

A SIG member indicated that he wanted to know who the scientists on the peer review panel will be. The MLPA staff answered that his request will be passed along to John Ugoretz (who had to leave early).

A SIG member asked about a staff template of goals and objectives he heard was available. Michael DeLapa answered that he was not aware of such a template.

### **Updates**

There will be some changes regarding the CCRSG meetings. Originally it was envisioned there would be two sub-groups. Staff is finding that many issues need to be addressed by the group as a whole. As such, the August 10 and 11 meeting will be held in Monterey and the meeting in September will be combined. It will be decided at the August meeting whether the October meeting will also be combined. The BRTF, however, will stick to its original meeting schedule with its next meeting in San Luis Obispo on September 28 and 29.

The next call is scheduled for October 7 from 12:00 to 2:00 pm. SIG members are invited to send suggestions for agenda items.

### **Closing Thoughts**

Chair Isenberg stated that as we come closer to recommendations the difficulty increases. We see some intense battles to come. We will be grappling with the question of at what point does the BRTF say, "Just give us the alternatives." We thank you for your active support and participation.

**California Marine Life Protection Act Initiative  
Statewide Interests Group  
Draft Meeting Agenda  
October 7, 2005  
12:00 noon via conference call**

**Call-in information: *Dial toll free 800.974.2163 and enter passcode 40142959# when prompted. Note that you must press the pound sign (#) after entering the passcode.***

***Meeting Objectives***

- *Receive update on central coast process*
- *Reminder of process and deadline for submitting MPA proposals*
- *Discuss additional science presentations*
- *Debrief September task force meeting*
- *Share other ideas for strengthening stakeholder involvement and process topics not specifically covered on other agenda items*
- *Updates on future meeting dates (BRTF, SIG, SAT and CCRSG)*
- *Summarize next steps*

- - - - -

- |    |   |                    |
|----|---|--------------------|
| 1. | Welcome, roll call, and logistics for conference call<br><i>Phil Isenberg, Chair, MLPA Blue Ribbon Task Force</i>   | 12:00 – 12:10 p.m. |
| 2. | Update on the Central Coast Project <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- membership</li><li>- dates and locations of meetings</li><li>- CCRSG process for developing alternative proposals</li><li>- submitting MPA proposals into the MLPA process</li><li>- questions?</li></ul> | 12:10 – 12:30 p.m. |
| 3. | September task force meeting <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- adoption of goals and objectives (see attachment)</li><li>- what went well?</li><li>- suggestions for changes</li></ul>  | 12:30 – 12:45 p.m. |
| 4. | Science presentations (see attachment) <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- at Blue Ribbon Task Force meetings</li><li>- at the Central Coast Regional Stakeholder Group meetings</li></ul>  | 12:45 – 12:55 p.m. |
| 5. | Open discussion <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- what topics would you like to address that haven't been asked?</li></ul>  | 12:55 – 1:10 p.m.  |
| 6. | Future meeting dates (see attachment)   | 1:10 – 1:20 p.m.   |
| 7. | Wrap up <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- action items and next steps</li><li>- suggestions for future SIG agenda items</li></ul>   | 1:20 – 1:30 p.m.   |

**CALIFORNIA MARINE LIFE PROTECTION ACT INITIATIVE  
STATEWIDE INTERESTS GROUP (SIG)  
OCTOBER 7, 2005 MEETING SUMMARY  
(12:00 noon - 1:30 p.m. via conference call)**

SIG members present: Steve Campi, Karen Garrison, Joel Greenberg, Nancy Hastings, Bill James, Ken Kurtis, Roberta Larson, Jesus Ruiz, Linda Sheehan

**Others present:** Phil Isenberg (Chair, MLPA BRTF), Francine Edralin (note taker; MLPA Initiative staff), Melissa Miller-Henson (MLPA Initiative staff), John Ugoretz (DFG staff), Jack Peveler (listening for Carol Abella)

**Acronyms used:** California Department of Fish and Game (DFG), California Fish and Game Commission (F&GC), geographic information system (GIS), marine protected area (MPA), MLPA Blue Ribbon Task Force (BRTF), MLPA Central Coast Project (CCP), MLPA Central Coast Regional Stakeholder Group (CCRSG), MLPA Master Plan Framework (MPF), MLPA Master Plan Science Advisory Team (SAT)

**Welcome, roll call, and logistics for conference call**

A warm welcome was extended to the SIG members participating by BRTF chair, and this meeting's facilitator, Phil Isenberg.

**Update on the Central Coast Project**

John Kirilin updated SIG members on the recent activities of the CCP. John Kirilin reports that there are currently no membership changes. The CCRSG just wrapped up the October meeting in Monterey, and the November meeting will be held in Cambria on the 9<sup>th</sup> and 10<sup>th</sup>. The final CCRSG meeting will be held in Monterey on December 6 and 7.

The October meeting went well; interaction between the stakeholder members was quite positive and many fears were quieted down as concerns were able to be expressed. The four small working groups worked well to achieve goals of different interests. MLPA and DFG staff were available to work with the groups. The meeting also focused on learning the GIS tool that is used to draw lines on maps; this tool can be effective when looking at groups of MPAs.

Progress was made at the October meeting regarding individual MPAs. Acceptable proposals will either suggest modifications or propose new MPAs and are due October 15. These proposals will be reviewed by the CCRSG for consideration. The October CCRSG meeting left MLPA Initiative staff hopeful in the ability to send a proposal to the BRTF and then by DFG to F&GC. The November CCRSG meeting in Cambria will be centered on understanding the concepts from the previous meeting, and shaping those concepts into packages. The December meeting will clarify areas of agreement.

Overall, the CCP is in fine form with a good design to make completion of the project in December 2005.

## **Comments**

Chair Isenberg noted that the tone of the meeting proved to be, and will continue to be, important to the CCRSG's work.

A SIG member congratulated the MLPA staff at the approach taken toward the CCRSG. MLPA staff commented that a lot of work went into the preparation for these meetings. The CCRSG ground rules were especially important in setting a positive tone to get the project's objectives accomplished.

Another SIG member was amazed at the CCRSG's progress and how well things have moved forward. He asked how the decision tool worked and more importantly how effective the tool is. John Kirlin answered that he thinks it works well and will prove to be valuable; it helps with the drawing of lines, and that is useful. The GIS tool allows you to pull up the data layers below line drawings. It'll prove to be more useful as we move forward. He also noted that online usage is limited to members of the stakeholder group.

Chairman Isenberg asked a SIG member what he thinks the group is doing correctly procedure-wise, so that they can continue to do so. The SIG member answered that the group thoroughly reacts, especially to time compression. If a topic drops off the table at a meeting, it's revisited at future meetings for discussion.

A SIG member noted that the cross sector groups are very affective. To hear others communicate their concerns in small groups about various sites and interests is not only important, but valuable.

A SIG member provided feedback regarding the sub groups. He felt that one group in particular got stuck on procedure and didn't get around to using the GIS mapping tool.

Another SIG member had a question regarding the SAT participation in the stakeholder group. What is the effect on species that already have a quota through traditional fisheries management, such as groundfish? Will or can the total allowable catch (TAC) be changed when MPAs are implemented? The SIG member feels this question has not been addressed and that the fishermen need to understand the bottom line once MPAs are put into place. John Kirlin suggested that this question be taken directly to the SAT.

## **September Task Force Meeting**

The September BRTF meeting was abbreviated into a long, one day session. Things that went right/wrong:

- Issues moved along nicely
- A few items that were important to stakeholders floated past the meeting because of time compression
- BRTF members made good inquiries regarding science questions

## **Open Discussion**

Jack Peveler brought up the citing of MLPA by harbors. When MPAs are designated, what restrictions are going to be put on harbors? He just wants to know that this issue is being addressed. John Kirlin answered that the concern is well represented in the stakeholder group, as some members and alternates on the CCRSG are harbormasters.

Kevin Cooper heard something about restrictions being listed on sea otters at the Channel Islands. Steve Campi answered that the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service is seeking comments on their sea otter plan, where they propose not to restrict sea otter range or relocate any sea otters. The public has until January 2006 to comment on the plan.

Linda Sheehan asked a question regarding the science presentations, and wanted to know the time frame of the water quality draft. John Kirlin answered that a good first draft was presented at the last SAT meeting. Ken Schiff is working on a draft revision, and this will be discussed further at the October 18 SAT meeting.

## **Future meeting dates**

October 18, 2005: SAT meeting in San Luis Obispo

November 9-8, 2005: CCRSG meeting in Morro Bay. This meeting will focus on creating packages of MPAs and on network design.

November 29-30, 2005: BRTF meeting in Monterey/Santa Cruz. This meeting will be the first time the task force members will see what the CCRSG is working with and perhaps the first and only chance to look at the long term funding report. The long term funding report is one of the five deliverables under the initiative. Craig Brown and Tim Gage are preparing the first draft and will attend to the BRTF meeting to talk about the range of proposals. John Kirlin will ask them how much money we are seeking to raise and the new budget claims since the introduction of the Ocean Protection Council. Also brought to the table will be the SAT presentation on network design if it is available.

Chair Isenberg inquires if the BRTF will be asked to adopt anything related to the CCP. John Kirlin answered that they won't, but rather this meeting will serve as information regarding the packages and identification of whether the packages as being designed meet the requirements of the MLPA. Chair Isenberg wants to encourage public comment for the BRTF meeting.

Mid-March 2006 will be the final BRTF meeting before the deadline for making recommendations to DFG for the central coast. Chair Isenberg added that the meeting will be in mid-March or earlier and the BRTF will be making its recommendations based on the CCRSG's hard work.

## **Wrap Up**

A SIG member had questions regarding SAT issues. Current stock assessment models are having difficulty functioning when MPAs are present. How much sampling information is needed for regional models, how localized, and how much of it needs to be conducted? John Ugoretz responded that DFG is spending money on this issue, and he wants to see results. The SIG member specifically wants the SAT to discuss this issue; he added that as the monitoring and evaluation plan is being prepared, staff should remember the lessons learned from the CRANE data collection and monitoring at Channel Islands.

John Kirlin responded that the SAT will discuss what has gone right/wrong with the Channel Islands, and what lessons we can learn; it will be a small discussion as there is urgency to move on.

Chair Isenberg thanked everyone for a productive meeting and then adjourned the meeting.

**California Marine Life Protection Act Initiative  
Statewide Interests Group  
Draft Meeting Agenda  
December 15, 2005  
2:00 p.m. via conference call**

**Call-in information: *Dial toll free 800.974.2163 and enter passcode 59828675# when prompted. Note that you must press the pound sign (#) after entering the passcode.***

**Meeting Objectives**

- *Receive update on central coast process*
- *Receive update on science team presentations*
- *Debrief November task force meeting*
- *Discuss "lessons learned" project*
- *Share other ideas for strengthening stakeholder involvement and process topics not specifically covered on other agenda items*
- *Updates on future meeting dates (BRTF, SIG and SAT)*
- *Summarize next steps*

- - - - -

- |    |   |                  |
|----|---|------------------|
| 1. | Welcome, roll call, and logistics for conference call<br><i>Phil Isenberg, Chair, MLPA Blue Ribbon Task Force</i>   | 2:00 – 2:10 p.m. |
| 2. | Update on the Central Coast Project <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- November and December meetings (see attachments)</li><li>- CCRSG proposals for alternative MPA packages</li><li>- next steps for proposals</li><li>- questions?</li></ul> | 2:10 – 2:30 p.m. |
| 3. | Update on science team presentations (see page 2)   | 2:30 – 2:40 p.m. |
| 4. | November task force meeting <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- revisions to goals and objectives (see page 3)</li><li>- strategy for long-term funding</li><li>- what went well</li><li>- suggestions for changes</li></ul>                      | 2:40 – 2:55 p.m. |
| 5. | Lessons learned project (see attachment)  | 2:55 – 3:15 p.m. |
| 6. | Open discussion <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- what topics would you like to address that haven't been asked?</li></ul>  | 3:15 – 3:30 p.m. |
| 7. | Future meeting dates (see page 8)   | 3:30 – 3:35 p.m. |
| 8. | Wrap up <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- action items and next steps</li><li>- suggestions for future SIG agenda items</li></ul>   | 3:35 – 3:45 p.m. |

**CALIFORNIA MARINE LIFE PROTECTION ACT INITIATIVE  
STATEWIDE INTERESTS GROUP  
DECEMBER 15, 2005 MEETING SUMMARY  
(2:00 - 3:45 p.m. via conference call)**

**SIG members present:** Carol Abella, Steve Campi, James Colston, Kevin Cooper, Karen Garrison, Joel Greenberg, Nancy Hastings, Ken Kurtis, Dr. James Liu, Jim Martin, Jesús Ruiz, Steve Scheiblaue

**Others present:** Phil Isenberg (chair, MLPA Blue Ribbon Task Force), Amy Boone (note taker; MLPA Initiative staff), John Kirlin (MLPA Initiative staff), Melissa Miller-Henson (MLPA Initiative staff), John Ugoretz (DFG staff)

**Acronyms used:** California Department of Fish and Game (DFG), marine protected area (MPA), MLPA Blue Ribbon Task Force (BRTF), MLPA Central Coast Project (CCP), MLPA Central Coast Regional Stakeholder Group (CCRS), MLPA Lessons Learned Project (LLP), MLPA Master Plan Framework (MPF), MLPA Master Plan Science Advisory Team (SAT)

**Welcome, Roll Call, and Logistics for Conference Call**

The meeting began with a brief welcome by Phil Isenberg, chair of the MLPA BRTF. Chair Isenberg reminded participants to please mute their phones if in a noisy environment.

**Update on Central Coast Process**

John Kirlin provided a summary of the two CCRSG meetings in November (Cambria) and December (Monterey). At the December CCRSG, the number of internal packages was reduced to three through a process of straw voting. Final revisions to the remaining packages were due for submission at 8:00 a.m. today. The SAT evaluation sub-team will be meeting tomorrow (Friday, December 16, 2005) to work with MLPA Initiative staff on developing a work plan. Initiative staff expects to be able to post to the website the initial SAT sub-team evaluation of packages one week before the next SAT meeting, or by January 13, 2006. Staff expects to be able to post the final SAT evaluation as soon as possible after the SAT meeting January 20, 2005 and at least one week prior to the next BRTF meeting on January 31, 2006.

SIG member questions included how the SAT will evaluate the packages and how their criteria for evaluation relate to the MPF. John Kirlin clarified that the SAT will be asked to evaluate whether the packages meet the requirements of the MLPA and if not, why. The SAT will not rank the proposals. Lastly, all of the criteria used by the SAT will be based upon criteria set forth in the MPF; if not, the criteria will be forwarded to the BRTF.

A SIG member expressed concern about the lack of time between the SAT meeting on January 20 and the BRTF meeting on January 31-February 1 and hopes that the BRTF will allow flexibility for proposals to change based upon SAT guidance.

A SIG member asked that the BRTF be privileged to know differing opinions of the SAT members regarding the evaluation. John Kirlin stated that he intends to bring all information from the SAT forward to the BRTF, including any dissenting opinions.

A SIG member expressed concern that the presentation on initial package evaluations by Dr. Gaines, Dr. Carr, and Dr. Palumbi at the November BRTF meeting had not been discussed in SIG meetings previously. John Kirlin explained that the presentation on initial package evaluations was completed in a short timeframe of approximately three to four days so that package proponents would benefit from SAT feedback before the CCRSG meeting on December 9-10, 2005.

A SIG member expressed appreciation to the BRTF for allowing Richard Parrish to speak on the panel of package proponents at the last BRTF meeting. The same member also expressed appreciation to the BRTF for directing pointed questions to both the SAT members and package proponents.

### **Update on SAT Presentations**

John Ugoretz referenced the science presentations that have been made to the BRTF and were attached to the SIG agenda as item #3. John Ugoretz reiterated that the SAT evaluation sub-team will be meeting on Friday, December 16, 2005. He also stated that a draft SAT evaluation will be available to the public at least one week before the BRTF meeting January 31-February 1, 2006.

A SIG member asked whether the SAT guidelines as stated in the MPF will be peer reviewed. John Ugoretz replied that Oregon Sea Grant is currently conducting the peer review and will have results by the first of the year.

A SIG member expressed concern over the SAT water quality presentation at the November BRTF meeting and believed that it was not as expansive as it could have been if the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) had been involved. Melissa Miller-Henson responded that, even though not present at the BRTF meeting, the SWRCB was invited to contribute to the presentation. The SIG member concluded by saying she will follow-up with a written statement to the BRTF.

### **November Task Force Meeting**

John Kirlin presented an overview of the November 29-30, 2005 BRTF meeting in Monterey. The BRTF received two science presentations (one on MPA networks and one on water quality) in addition to the SAT initial evaluations of package proposals. Package proponents were able to make short presentations to the BRTF and received questions. There were two action items regarding design and implementation.

Tim Gage and Craig Brown, former directors of the California Department of Finance and consultants to the MLPA Initiative, presented their work on long-term financing for marine protected areas in California. The BRTF received the report and, with minor modifications, voted to forward the report to Secretary for Resources Mike Chrisman. Public comments on the long-term financing report (limited to strategic thinking, not editorial comments) are due by

January 6, 2006. The BRTF will then have a discussion at its next meeting about long-term financing and may decide to forward more strategic thinking to the secretary for resources.

A SIG member expressed concerns over the “rigs to reef” proposal in the long-term funding report. She will submit written comments regarding this issue to the BRTF.

A SIG member requested that package proponents be allowed more time to present their packages than what was allowed at the November BRTF meeting.

### **Lessons Learned Project**

John Kirlin described the MLPA Lessons Learned Project (LLP) for which SIG members received a draft work plan as an attachment to the agenda for this meeting. The purpose of the LLP is to solicit feedback from participants in the CCP in order to improve the process for the next study region. Staff has been working on a draft request for statements of qualifications that will be sent to the SIG list server. John Kirlin encouraged SIG members to spread the word regarding the request and to recommend individuals or firms that might be interested in this type of work and that have relevant experience.

Chair Isenberg reiterated the importance of this project and stated that it is necessary to solicit feedback as soon as possible before participants forget or before their opinion of the process is modified by the results of the process. Chair Isenberg encouraged all SIG members to participate in the LLP.

A SIG member applauded this effort and had several recommendations of other similar reports.

A SIG member expressed concern over how participants will be selected to participate in the LLP. Chair Isenberg stated that there will be adequate time given for written comments from SIG members.

Several SIG members expressed their desire for participants to anonymously contribute to the LLP report. John Kirlin replied that this opportunity would be provided.

### **Open Discussion**

#### *Socioeconomic information*

Several SIG members expressed concern over the use of the Ecotrust data and maps. One member expressed concern that the maps were not distributed to CCRSG members. John Kirlin replied that the Ecotrust maps presented at the November CCRSG meeting were not circulated to CCRSG members for purposes of confidentiality; the fishermen gave permission for the maps to be used in the meeting, but not to be distributed. He also stated that the data is housed on DFG computers and can be used by CCRSG members at the DFG offices. Another SIG member expressed concern that the Ecotrust methodology has not been peer reviewed.

John Kirlin responded that Ecotrust's methods are common social science methods and not anything out of the ordinary. In addition, Ecotrust will provide a full description of their methods.

Several SIG members expressed concern that socioeconomic impacts are not being adequately considered in this process. John Kirlin stated that the requirements of the MLPA are for stakeholder input into socioeconomic consideration. He went on to say that some comments from BRTF members may have implied a greater socioeconomic analysis than what is required by the law.

John Kirlin went on to state that the Ecotrust data, combine with DFG data, will be used for socioeconomic evaluation of the proposed packages. He also noted that there is intense interest in socioeconomic information and that this data is difficult and time-consuming to collect.

#### *Inclusion of fisheries management*

A SIG member reminded staff that the California Fisheries Coalition (CFC) has requested that a presentation regarding fisheries management be made at the next BRTF meeting. John Kirlin replied that fisheries management has been discussed at several BRTF meetings and expressed concern that, if CFC is allowed to make this presentation, other stakeholder groups will want to make presentations as well which will limit the time the BRTF has to do its work. Chair Isenberg stated that the role of the BRTF is to evaluate proposals and make recommendations and that fisheries management is not part of the statute of the MLPA. Several SIG members stated that they disagreed with John Kirlin and Chair Isenberg's interpretation of the act.

#### *Next study region for MLPA implementation*

A SIG member asked when the next study region for MLPA implementation will be chosen. John Kirlin answered that he has written an options memo for Secretary Mike Chrisman but that it is not within the role of the MLPA Initiative to make such a decision. Chair Isenberg followed by stating that the choice of the next study region will be influenced by future events, most notably the LLP.

#### **Future Dates**

Melissa Miller-Henson reminded members of relevant future dates, including:

- December 21, 2005: Comments due regarding the draft work plan for the lessons learned project.
- January 6, 2006: Comments due regarding the long-term financing of the MLPA (please limit comments to financing strategies, not editorial comments).
- January 20, 2006: SAT meeting (San Jose)
- January 31 - February 1, 2006: BRTF meeting (San Luis Obispo area)
- February ?, 2006: SIG conference call (approx 10 days after BRTF)

- March 2, 2006: SAT meeting (San Luis Obispo)
- March 14-15, 2006: BRTF meeting (Monterey area)
- March ?, 2006: SIG conference call (approx 10 days after BRTF)
- May 1, 2006: SAT meeting (San Jose)
- May ?, 2006: Joint BRTF / Fish and Game Commission meeting (Sacramento)

**California Marine Life Protection Act Initiative**  
**Statewide Interests Group**  
**Draft Meeting Agenda for February 17, 2006**  
**10:00 a.m. via conference call**  
*Revised February 16, 2006*

**Call-in information: *Dial toll free 800.974.2163 and enter passcode 40680128# when prompted. Note that you must press the pound sign (#) after entering the passcode.***

**Meeting Objectives**

- *Receive update on central coast process and MPA packages*
- *Debrief January 31 & February 1 task force meeting*
- *Receive update on "lessons learned" project*
- *Share other ideas for strengthening stakeholder involvement and process topics not specifically covered in other agenda items*
- *Updates on future meetings (BRTF, SIG and SAT)*
- *Summarize next steps*

- - - - -

- |    |  |                    |
|----|--|--------------------|
| 1. | Welcome, roll call, and logistics for conference call<br><i>Phil Isenberg, Chair, MLPA Blue Ribbon Task Force</i>  | 10:00 – 10:10 a.m. |
| 2. | Update on the Central Coast Project <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Central coast proposals for alternative MPA packages</li><li>- SAT review of proposals</li><li>- BRTF review of proposals</li><li>- questions?</li></ul> | 10:10 – 10:40 a.m. |
| 3. | January 31 & February 1 task force meeting <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- strategy for long-term funding</li><li>- framework documents</li><li>- what went well</li><li>- suggestions for changes</li></ul>                 | 10:40 – 11:00 a.m. |
| 4. | Update on lessons learned project  | 11:00 – 11:05 a.m. |
| 5. | Open discussion <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- what questions or topics would you like to address that haven't been asked?</li></ul>  | 11:05 – 11:20 a.m. |
| 6. | Future meeting dates (see page 2)  | 11:20 – 11:25 a.m. |
| 7. | Wrap up <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- action items and next steps</li><li>- suggestions for future SIG agenda items</li></ul>  | 11:25 – 11:30 a.m. |

**California Marine Life Protection Act Initiative  
Master Calendar  
*Revised February 14, 2005***

February 17	SIG conference call (10:00 – 11:30 a.m.)
March 2	SAT meeting (San Jose area)
March 14-15	BRTF meeting (Embassy Suites, Seaside)
March 24	SIG conference call (2:00 – 4:00 p.m.)
May 1	SAT meeting (San Jose area)
May 25	Joint BRTF / California Fish and Game Commission meeting (Sacramento)

*SIG = MLPA Statewide Interests Group  
SAT = MLPA Master Plan Science Advisory Team  
BRTF = MLPA Blue Ribbon Task Force*

**CALIFORNIA MARINE LIFE PROTECTION ACT INITIATIVE  
STATEWIDE INTERESTS GROUP  
FEBRUARY 17, 2006 MEETING SUMMARY  
(10:00-11:30 a.m. via conference call)**

**SIG members present:** Steve Campi, Don Canestro, Karen Garrison, Joel Greenberg, Pam Heatherington, Bill James, Ken Kurtis, Roberta Larson, Dr. James Liu, Dick Long, Jim Martin, Corrine Monroe, Jesús Ruiz, Steve Scheiblauber, Linda Sheehan, Dan Wolford

**Others present:** Phil Isenberg (chair, MLPA Blue Ribbon Task Force), Amy Boone (MLPA Initiative staff), John Kirlin (MLPA Initiative staff), Maura Leos (notetaker, DFG staff), Melissa Miller-Henson (MLPA Initiative staff), John Ugoretz (DFG staff)

**Acronyms used:** California Department of Fish and Game (DFG), geographic information system (GIS), Marine Life Protection Act (MLPA), marine protected area (MPA), MLPA Blue Ribbon Task Force (BRTF), MLPA Central Coast Regional Stakeholder Group (CCRS), MLPA Master Plan Framework (MPF), MLPA Master Plan Science Advisory Team (SAT)

### **Update on the Central Coast Project**

Chair Phil Isenberg asked for an overview of the CCRSG process. John Kirlin reported that the BRTF has received and considered five packages. One of those packages (Package B) was dropped on the advice from the SAT for not meeting criteria laid out in the MPF. The BRTF urged proponents of the packages to respond to SAT recommendations, meet with MLPA Initiative staff and the DFG, make revisions, and resubmit the packages to the BRTF. Package AC, however, is not undergoing any revisions at this time, nor is the “no action” (existing marine protected areas) alternative. At this time staff is preparing, by request of the BRTF, a separate preferred alternative.

A SIG member expressed concern over the timing for stakeholder input based on any possible new metrics put forth by the SAT. At a meeting held on February 6 with members of the SAT, initiative staff, DFG, and package proponents, the SAT indicated there would be no new metrics. The SIG member just wanted to hear that again.

There was curiosity as to what transpired at the February 6 meeting since it was not open to the public; summaries of the SAT sub-team evaluations will be posted to the website. There were no major adjustments made in the evaluation process.

John Kirlin did indicate one minor adjustment which was that, to account for the percentage of habitats in MPAs when the overall habitat amount in the region is extremely small or very large, using a percentage is not the best way to evaluate habitat coverage. The SAT will be adjusting the test for satisfying habitat coverage in cases where the habitat representation in a subregion is very large or very small. That discussion and explanation will be in the next SAT meeting summary. It will help close gaps. Regarding Package 1, there was a lot of hard work between package proponents and the SAT to be sure it meets all the guidelines. John Kirlin thanked everyone who participated for their extraordinarily hard work.

A SIG member asked if the SIG could get an individual accounting from the SAT of the vote on the evaluations of the packages. MLPA Initiative staff indicated that the audio and video of the SAT meeting and a summary will be posted to the website.

A SIG member wondered how the BRTF will merge different opinions when hearing about the analysis. The member was concerned about any conflicts. John Kirlin said that if the question is will the BRTF reject SAT guidance where there is conflict, there are reference points in the MPF to resolve conflicts. John Ugoretz indicated that since the SAT guidelines are not prescriptive, the BRTF can still forward the packages and not reject them on their entirety.

A SIG member wondered if there is a guideline that says you can't have an area smaller than what the SAT recommends. Staff indicated that the SAT guidelines are designed to meet some of the goals of the Marine Life Protection Act. Any areas set up to meet other goals won't be analyzed using the SAT guidelines.

A SIG member indicated that the small MPAs in the Monterey Peninsula area do not meet the SAT guidance or the law. The SAT review didn't analyze the packages with respect to the third goal of the MLPA. The SIG member felt there was heavy handed guidance by staff at the February 6 meeting. Divers have concerns over the ramifications of the redesign.

Chair Isenberg stated that the package proponents should come as close as they can to meeting the recommendations made by the SAT.

A SIG member indicated some concern over the fact that the SAT guidance appears to be biological rather than socio-economic, and recommended that there needs to be more balance between the two.

### **January 31 and February 1 Task Force Meeting**

John Kirlin presented a quick overview of the January 31-February 1 BRTF meeting in Monterey. The BRTF approved the long-term funding strategy with minor editing and forwarded it to Secretary Chrisman. The BRTF received and authorized staff to post two framework documents (related to adaptive management) to the website with public comment requested by March 1. The meeting adjourned before the public comment period at 1:00 p.m. A SIG member indicated that this is an issue needing to be addressed. Answer: There is no guarantee of time for public comment and the BRTF will not hang around for hours after completing its work to hear it. The BRTF appreciated hearing the mayor of Morro Bay speak, but the BRTF doesn't need to have any city officials speak in Monterey. The BRTF asks the public to please not organize 500 people to show up just to say the oceans are fine or not.

### **Update on Lessons Learned Project**

John Kirlin discussed the idea of a "lessons learned" document to be produced to assist in the next project area. The Central Coast Regional Stakeholder Group was the "pilot" program which will now be repeated. Initiative staff will be producing an operations book of how the

process functioned as well as contracting with an outside group to interview stakeholders in order to put together the lessons learned document. Initiative staff will be able to report to the BRTF at the March 14-15 meeting on the progress of this project.

## **Open Discussion**

A SIG member wished to challenge the larval transport theory. He wanted to know what the mechanisms were and if there was funding available to flesh out some additional ideas. Staff suggested that when evidence comes to the SAT, the members make recommendations; their guidance has been driven by habitat. The MPF is a living document with best available science, which has been peer reviewed. The peer review will be made public at the March meeting of the SAT. Staff hears an underlying thrust to the concern: you have information to provide and you think you are being shut out of the process. The SIG member answered yes, and wants to know the avenues available to present this information.

The question was asked of the SIG in general if others feel their viewpoints are being shut out.

A SIG member indicated he is trying to get his constituency to comment. However, there has been no "big picture" summary for the lay person, so it has been hard to generate interest. In addition, there has been no time to prepare an analysis once the packages are made available. It would be helpful to be shown the big picture sooner and be given sufficient time to analyze the packages so that we can provide substantive comment.

Another SIG member commented there were a whole lot of representatives from stakeholder groups in the regional process. Those stakeholders were selected to do a filtering and synthesizing of information. It is important to stay in touch with them to find out what is going on with the process and packages. The member is confident that, if the CCRSG process is repeated exactly in Southern California, it will work; he can't make specific comments about the CCRSG since he wasn't there. This is a statement to include in the lessons learned effort. Perhaps it could be done in such a way as to ask, "HOW does it happen?"

There are a number of SIG members that believe the process has had sufficient public input from the beginning. All the packages were offered to the public with nothing hidden. It is possible to comply with the law with an open and participatory process. Even if a person didn't like the outcomes, at least it can't be said there was a preconceived approach or outcome.

SIG members wanted to know who exactly is defined as "staff." Does staff include California Department of Fish and Game personnel? The answer was no, staff is the MLPA Initiative/BRTF staff, including John Kirlin, Melissa Miller-Henson, Amy Boone and consultants. DFG is not making any recommendations, only the BRTF staff; DFG advises MLPA Initiative staff the same way it advises stakeholders and CCRSG members. DFG will make changes to the recommendations before the packages go to the California Fish and Game Commission. This is the way the process was designed; adoption of the MPF is an example.

*California Marine Life Protection Act Initiative  
Statewide Interests Group  
February 17, 2006 Meeting Summary*

Staff was commended on getting documents up on the website in a timely manner. Staff stated the website will soon be transferred to the DFG servers and, when fully operational, will be easier to use in locating information.

Chair Isenberg adjourned the call.

**California Marine Life Protection Act Initiative**  
**Statewide Interests Group**  
**Draft Meeting Agenda for March 24, 2006**  
**2:00 p.m. via conference call**  
*Revised March 22, 2006*

**Call-in information: *Dial toll free 800.974.2163 and enter passcode 71457282# when prompted. Note that you must press the pound sign (#) after entering the passcode.***

**Meeting Objectives**

- *Receive update on MPA packages*
- *Debrief March 14-15, 2006 task force meeting (including updates on items not covered)*
- *Additional tasks to support MLPA implementation approved by task force*
- *Share other ideas for strengthening stakeholder involvement and process topics not specifically covered in other agenda items*
- *Updates on future meetings (BRTF, SIG and SAT)*
- *Summarize next steps*

- - - - -

- |    |   |                  |
|----|---|------------------|
| 1. | Welcome, roll call, and logistics for conference call<br><i>Phil Isenberg, Chair, MLPA Blue Ribbon Task Force</i>   | 2:00 – 2:10 p.m. |
| 2. | Update on central coast MPA packages <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Task force actions (see memo starting on page 3)</li><li>- what is being forwarded to DFG</li><li>- SAT review of proposals</li><li>- questions?</li></ul> | 2:10 – 2:20 p.m. |
| 3. | March 14-15, 2006 task force meeting <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- framework documents (comments due April 14)</li><li>- long-term cost estimates</li><li>- what went well</li><li>- suggestions for changes</li></ul>        | 2:20 – 2:50 p.m. |
| 4. | Additional tasks to support MLPA implementation <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- MLPA Central Coast Project as it moves forward</li><li>- preparing for next study region</li></ul>  | 2:50 – 3:05 p.m. |
| 5. | Open discussion <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- what questions or topics would you like to address that haven't been asked?</li></ul>   | 3:05 – 3:20 p.m. |
| 6. | Future meeting dates (see page 2)   | 3:20 – 3:25 p.m. |
| 7. | Wrap up <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- action items and next steps</li><li>- suggestions for future SIG agenda items</li></ul>   | 3:25 – 3:30 p.m. |

**CALIFORNIA MARINE LIFE PROTECTION ACT INITIATIVE  
STATEWIDE INTERESTS GROUP  
MARCH 24, 2005 MEETING SUMMARY  
(2:00-3:30 p.m. via conference call)**

**SIG members present:** Don Canestro, Eric Endersby, Karen Garrison, Vern Goerhing, Ken Kurtis, Mike Osmond, Linda Sheehan, Erin Simmons

**Others present:** Phil Isenberg (Chair, MLPA Blue Ribbon Task Force), Amy Boone (MLPA Initiative staff), John Kirlin (MLPA Initiative staff), Maura Leos (notetaker, DFG staff), Melissa Miller-Henson (MLPA Initiative staff), Jack Peveler (listening for Carol Abella)

**Acronyms used:** California Department of Fish and Game (DFG), California Fish and Game Commission (F&GC), geographic information system (GIS), Marine Life Protection Act (MLPA), marine protected area (MPA), MLPA Blue Ribbon Task Force (BRTF), MLPA Central Coast Regional Stakeholder Group (CCRSG), MLPA Master Plan Framework (MPF), MLPA Master Plan Science Advisory Team (SAT)

### **Update on Central Coast MPA Packages**

For those not at the meeting in Monterey on March 14-15, a summary of the outcome was included as a memo attached to the agenda for this meeting. Posted to the website are maps of the revised packages, including amended errors in Package 3R (these were posted on Monday). Staff is working on the regulations proposed in each package and hope to have them finished next Monday. This will be presented in the same format as previously, in table form for each package. The news release was posted. As documents are developed staff will produce side by side maps.

There was some concern expressed that it is difficult to follow the links. The MLPA Central Coast Project webpage should be at the top so "Joe Diver" can see exactly where to go. There should be something directing visitors to the website. Staff responded that the new website, which has now been transferred to the DFG test servers, will have that format. It is scheduled to go "live" after the task force materials are posted. As far as what else is likely to be posted over time, there will be the SAT evaluation of the packages; that is still some time away since the packages will have to be formally transmitted to DFG. The transmittal will probably happen sometime in the next couple of weeks, but it will essentially be a record of action and will not have SAT evaluations. Staff will continue to talk with Sonke Mastrup (DFG) and John Carlson (executive director of the California Fish and Game Commission) to put the materials in the best, most useful format.

A SIG member asked if there is anticipated SAT review and when? Staff answered that the SAT meets on May 1, 2006. Evaluations are not expected to be publicly released until there is a full SAT review.

One of the SIG members indicated the memo attached to the agenda for this meeting that summarizes the convoluted motions was very informative; it really helped clarify what happened at the meeting and should be posted on the website. Staff indicated that it will be posted.

### **March 14-15, 2006 Task Force Meeting**

John Kirlin reported that because the BRTF focused on the central coast MPA packages, the framework documents and long-term cost estimates were not discussed at the March 14-15 BRTF meeting. Staff is asking for everyone to look at those documents and provide any comments by April 14, 2006.

Amy Boone discussed the long-term cost estimates document she was not able to present at the BRTF meeting. Staff is developing a cost model and is fairly close to having a version available for public comment. This is further development of work Amy started with the consultants and includes how much revenue needs to be raised for long-term implementation of the MLPA. Staff is using the Florida Keys National Marine Sanctuary and the Channel Islands process to arrive at more solid numbers. Staff is waiting for the final round of revisions and then the document should be ready to go out in the next couple of weeks. A number of stakeholders have continued to engage in dialogue with staff on this issue.

A SIG member asked if this was just for the central coast or the entire California coast. Staff answered that it applies to the whole coast, broken down over the next ten years and is just cost estimates, not from where the revenue is coming.

A SIG member commented that he hadn't read the original document thoroughly, but he suspects we are looking at a budget over hundreds of millions of dollars. Staff believe the cost estimates (analyses) will indeed be a substantial number. The cost model is a professionally defensible approach and is not a lowball approach.

John Kirlin asked SIG members to comment on what went right and what went wrong at the BRTF meeting.

A SIG member noted that he had received a couple of email messages from close watchers of the meeting, with the complaint that existing fishery management was not considered by the SAT in its evaluations. Some stakeholders believe the SAT members are biased and that the BRTF followed that bias in its decision. As a result, moving to the remaining regions with this process would be counterproductive. A second complaint was made about the "preferred" MPA size concept and the fact that it is not listed in the legislation.

Discussion ensued about how much of the complaints are related to the outcome or the process. The folks who wrote the email message weren't really clear about what the outcome was from the BRTF meeting and SAT analyses. The same folks complained about the information in the framework; they didn't feel size and spacing belonged in that document.

A SIG member commented, and others agreed, that the BRTF made too many decisions at the last moment; that kind of last-minute action leaves folks wondering if somehow all those months of stakeholder process were simply changed in a day. Another SIG member asked, "By the same token, isn't the process such that the Fish and Game Commission can come to

an independent, different conclusion?” While true, a SIG member suggested that the legacy of the BRTF was to pass on a package from the stakeholders, which didn’t happen in a couple of cases. In general, stakeholders would like to see more clarity and less “mucking around” by the BRTF. The merging of Package S into Package 3 was especially confusing since it wasn’t done in public and was explained very quickly.

Staff asked what this means for subsequent processes, should only interest groups give packages to the F&GC? The SIG members generally answered no, but also said that maybe there should not be a BRTF later. A SIG member said that we need to establish meaningful MPAs.

Staff then asked how the next stage should be handled to include stakeholders. A SIG member answered that there was just enough stakeholder input. Staff got the best and the finest in the case of central coast stakeholders. What is a concern about doing it again this way is that people will look back at the CCRSG process and the perception will be that this was really done on the very last day by the BRTF and the stakeholder process was ultimately a waste of time.

A SIG member commented on the public trust of the process; many feel the rug was pulled out from under them. Staff asked if the SIG members feel the BRTF should not have been authorized to make its own recommendation. A SIG member answered that perhaps it should have been done earlier in the process. Staff commented that the BRTF needed to receive recommendations from the stakeholders; ultimately, the stakeholder packages were not all that far apart on major issues.

Another SIG member expressed feeling a similar way; some stakeholders went into the process believing that the BRTF would review, not modify, packages. It was not in the framework to do things this way. When the process came to an end and packages 1, 2, and 3 floated to the top, some CCRSG members had an understanding that the BRTF would have comments but that the final action would simply be a review and recommended changes that would then go forward to the F&GC. Staff responded that, no, the MPF specifically directs the BRTF to recommend a preferred alternative. The SIG member responded that the BRTF should have sent the stakeholder packages forward with suggested changes only. To a degree, what happened has “queered” the next process.

There was a brief discussion regarding Package AC, the combined outside package that the BRTF dropped altogether in the last meeting. Some SIG members felt there had been enough dialogue with CCRSG members to warrant this, and others felt the opposite. There was opinion stated that the BRTF had a job to listen to the public as well as the CCRSG and the BRTF didn’t pick a strong enough alternative (for protection purposes).

The SIG members were reminded that the purpose of this call is to see how we can make it stronger in the future. A SIG member indicated that the SIG’s task is in part to sell the idea that just because individuals didn’t necessarily get what they wanted doesn’t mean the process isn’t working; SIG members aren’t doing their job right with constituents if they don’t make it

clear that it's more about process and ensuring that all sides are heard, not that everyone gets their way.

Chair Isenberg identified what he thought he was hearing in the conversation, that is, that the failure of the meeting really was the fact that it could not be characterized as a crushing victory or defeat for one side or the other.

A SIG member responded, no. What happened was a great improvement over other public processes. The fishing community received a lot more attention out of this than from any other process. The comments from members of the fishing community came from "...some of our best and brightest....."

The SIG members were reminded about the MLPA Lessons Learned Project. It was suggested that it would be helpful to have in mind what process stakeholders would have liked to see if not the one that took place. Think about what was expected and would have liked to have seen rather than just indicate unhappiness about this process.

Chair Isenberg asked one of the SIG members to put on his hat as meeting and computer advisor and give staff thoughts about the streaming video. How can it be made better? The SIG member said the best person to answer the question is Steve Mathieu from SLO-Span. He doesn't have the budget he needs to make this more professional. The ultimate solution may be the DVDs; being able to review the DVDs of the meetings is very, very helpful.

A SIG member asked about how a preferred alternative will be chosen in the next round of MLPA without a BRTF. Staff indicated that the state still hasn't made a decision about whether there will be a BRTF and, if not, how a preferred alternative will be selected. Question: What about the possibility of keeping the BRTF together just for that purpose? And, are these some of the reflections the lessons learned consultants will be going through? Staff said, yes, and staff have a conference call with the consultants on refining their work plans and laying out a schedule for contacting people. Staff would like you to suggest options for the future. Part of what made this process work was the BRTF. That function needs to be performed somehow if not by the BRTF.

Chair Isenberg indicated that he thought part of the process making this confusing was that the BRTF encouraged proponents to keep providing their views and changes long after the CCRSG process was over. This delayed the overall process. Someone needs to say stop, no more changes, earlier, to allow the BRTF to do its job better.

### **Additional Tasks to Support MLPA Implementation**

There was a very short discussion about preparing for the next study region. There is a memo being developed explaining needed preparations for the next study region with regard to data layers and further development of decision support tools. Staff understanding of the process and data needs is better than it was and is now being put in place for the next region. It would be good if staff knew what the boundaries were for future study regions so we could create

study layers based on those boundaries. A SIG member suggested that, in the implementation of the central coast phase, please support data collection as soon as possible as people are already asking for money to do baseline studies.

A SIG member asked if this subject was likely to surface at the May BRTF meeting. Staff is working to develop this information with DFG, so it may be reported at the May meeting. This activity was not part of the charge for the MLPA Initiative, but it makes a lot of sense in order to move MLPA forward.

### **Open Discussion**

A SIG member made note of how few folks are actually involved in the conference call, which reflects a general apathy in his opinion. No one has a clue about what's happening for the next region. The reality is it needs to go somewhere because that is what the law requires, but there is no input on where to go next and only DFG can provide the necessary input on what is doable once the BRTF has retired. There has been input and public comment and the next place could be anywhere from south of the central coast study region to north of San Francisco Bay. The SIG member said he will miss the BRTF; "you guys" have done something that has helped all of us to formulate how to participate. The BRTF is leaving behind something that will underscore the necessity of stakeholder involvement, and that includes ALL stakeholders.

A SIG member from the south was asked if he would like the process to come south. Point Conception to the border with Mexico constitutes less than one third of the coastline, yet contains more than three quarters of all MPAs in California; he said he felt that the south part of the state doesn't really need anything else. This doesn't mean folks in the south don't want to satisfy the act. MLPA is not the only act governing people out on the water; there is also the MLMA [Marine Life Management Act] and the feds, and they are all very important.

Another SIG member agreed. She likes the idea of moving north and sees more flexibility there. The longer there are some protected areas in place the more comfortable fishermen will become if they can see the benefits.

Will the lessons learned report talk about any of this? No, there is no expertise in this subject. Staff will have to address this issue, though there may end up being some take on this in the implications from the interviews. Southern California is one ecosystem. Staff is fully expecting interview participants will say this process has had a deep stakeholder involvement and will hear people make judgments. Participants might then recommend something of the same magnitude.

A couple of SIG members indicated that they felt the MLPA is in a vacuum. The BRTF would benefit from greater integration with other issues such as water quality, which was not as comprehensive as it should have been. The state water board should give its own briefing in the future. Many MPAs are placed where water quality is the bigger issue. Staff indicated that there is something in the BRTF's recommendation to forward to the F&GC related to the issue

of what happens on land being as important as what happens in the water. Without fixing the land issues you can't fix the water issues.

### **Future Meeting Dates**

Public comment on the three framework documents is due April 14, 2006. The next SAT meeting is May 1, 2006. The next BRTF meeting is May 25, 2006 and will be a joint meeting with the F&GC from 9:30 a.m. to 12:30 p.m. The next SIG conference call will be June 2, 2003 from 2:00 to 4:00 pm. There is a BRTF meeting tentatively scheduled for September 6-7, 2006 with another SIG conference call 10 days later. Finally, there will be a wrap-up meeting later in the year for the BRTF.

Chair Isenberg adjourned the call.